The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, MAY 6, 1886.

The Week.

THE great Southwestern boycott has been declared "off," in spite of the struggles of Martin Irons and his "Joint Executive Board, 101, 93, and 17." The eight-hour movement, in so far as it was grounded upon the belief that independent laborers and employers could be driven by force and terror to join in it or to yield to it, has failed. In some places and trades where the business could be sustained and yield some profit on eight hours of daily labor, the movement has been successful, and in such cases there is no room for complaint. Whatever is agreed to on both sides is a fair bargain, which no third person has a right to object to. It has been objected to only in one place so far. Mr. McCormick, at Chicago, agreed to adopt the eight-hour system without any reduction of wages. His works and his workmen were immediately set upon by a mob of eight-hour strikers and anarchists, who raided the establishment, beat several of the men as they were coming out at the stroke of the clock at the end of the eighth hour, and had a fight with a squad of policemen, one of whom they attempted to hang on a lamp-post while he was conducting a wounded man to his home. This was a notable exploit on the part of "organized labor."

The recent boycott on the Missouri Pacific Railway and its southwestern connections was not the most disastrous revolt against law and order in the name of labor that has been witnessed by the present generation, nor is the present eight-hour movement the most formidable. The struggle for "eight hours" has been going on for more than a quarter of a century, and it may go on for another quarter of a century. One of the phases of the movement most popular among its advocates a few years ago was the demand for an eight-hour law. It was held by the labor agitators that if a law were passed making eight hours a legal day's work, under appropriate penalties, the desired end would be reached. When the attempt was made to carry this idea into the form of a statute it was found to be impracticable. No machinery could be devised to prevent farm hands, for example, from working from sunrise to sunset. Nor could any means be found to subject "piece work" to the operation of the eight-hour system. So many difficulties were encountered that the framers of the proposed law were constrained to content themselves with a bill fixing eight hours as the maximum of labor on Government works. After the law was passed, the officers in charge of Government works reduced the pay to correspond with the hours, and then there was another outcry from the agitators. But it led to nothing. The idea of setting up a privileged class of laborers in Government employ, who were to have their wages raised 20 per cent. at the expense of all other laborers, did not prove to be excessively popular. In fact, we hear very little now about eight-hour laws. The movement has passed into another stage.

The question now is, whether the industrial conditions of the country are such as to warrant the belief that people in general can support themselves on the proceeds of eight hours' work. It is proposed by a relatively small number of workingmen to test this question by experiment. We say a relatively small number, because Mr. Edward Atkinson has proved by an examination of the statistics of industry that not more than one in ten of those who work with their hands can possibly be subjected to an eight-hour rule, whether that rule be put into the form of a statute, or whether it is sought to enforce it by the agency of the Walking Delegate. Thus the question narrows itself to this: Are there certain special branches of industry so favorably situated, and having such advantages over other trades, that they can sustain themselves on 20 per cent. less labor than is now applied to them? We are not prepared to say that there are no such trades. Whether they exist or not can only be learned by experiment. The experiment is now to be made. If it should be learned that there are such trades, the movement will succeed as to them. Eight hours will become the established day's work among them, at all events until capital and labor are attracted to them to such an extent as to reduce their exceptional advantages to the average of all other trades. There will be a struggle between employers and employees in these special branches of industry, but it will not be of long duration. The question being one of fact, it will be settled, as the Southwestern strike has been settled, when it is made clear what the facts are. Mr. Martin Irons said that the Missouri Pacific Railway could not be operated without the Knights of Labor. Mr. Hoxie said that it could be. Nothing but an experiment could settle that dispute. It was made, and it proved that Mr. Hoxie was right. In the same way and not otherwise can it be proved to general acceptance whether any particular trade can be carried on with the proceeds of eight hours' work. There is no occasion for panic while the experiment is going on. Nine-tenths of the daily work of the nation will go on as before. Indeed, if the statistics could be got at, it would be found that only a moiety of the trades susceptible of being reached by an eight-hour rule are now menaced by the movement.

In a report of what was done at Chicago on Monday last is a characteristic indication of the unreason of the eight-hour strikers. The Illinois Central Railway is really a State railway, since the company is, under its charter, required to pay 7 per cent. of its gross (not its net) earnings annually to the State. Whatever reduces or impairs the volume of the business of that company is a direct injury to the State, and to every taxpayer therein. The Governor of the State is by law one of the directors of the company. On Monday the workingmen who handle freight in the company's yard at Chicago demanded eight hours a day and ten hours' pay. Mr. Jeffery, the General Manager, met the workingmen, and said to them that during the last three months and three weeks the earnings of the company had decreased $375,642, as compared with the earnings of the same period last year. By the end of April the decrease will reach $400,000, and in all probability before the end of the year, through labor disruptions and disorganized trade, the decrease will amount to $800,000. Nearly every other road had experienced a decrease of from 10 to 20 per cent. in its earnings. The laboring classes, therefore, in view of these considerations, had struck at the wrong time. The only outcome of this movement was that they would remain out, lose money, injure their families, and return to their old places at the same rate. The men listened quietly to Mr. Jeffery's remarks, though they saw at once what the reply of the company was. When he had finished, all the men, to the number of 150, quit work, marched over to the headquarters of the Freight-Handlers' Union, and joined that organization.

The Illinois Central Company has had honest and efficient management. Its capital stock has never been "watered"; it has never been depleted by "construction companies," and there are no side-companies, either "Blue Lines," or "White Lines," or "Star Lines," by which the earnings are diverted from the pockets of the owners of the Illinois Central. By economy and good management the company has until recently continued to pay its stockholders 8 per cent. Civil-service promotion has long been the rule in the company. Mr. Jeffery, the General Manager, began in the company's service a poor boy, relatively in the condition of the workingmen whom he addressed. He frankly told the men the condition of the company's gross earnings, and frankly suggested to them that with increased earnings would come increased wages; but the men quit work and thereby increased the burdens of every taxpayer in the State, including themselves.

The House Committee on Invalid Pensions has instructed Representative Matson to call up the Arrears of Pension Bill as soon as the Committee is called by the Speaker, which, it is expected, will be the latter part of this week or the early part of next week. This is the most dangerous scheme likely to be brought before Congress at this session, and public sentiment ought to pronounce against it in such tones as will deter the demagogues from supporting the bill. A careful estimate indicates that the measure would be likely to take out of the Treasury about $300,000,000, and there is absolutely no sound argument in favor of it. Senator Sherman, in opposing a similar proposition two years ago, when Commissioner Dudley had estimated that it would call for $246,000,000 at least, thus summed up the reasons against it:

"I deny in toto that there in any obligation in law or in morals or in good faith to our soldiers to remove the restrictions of existing law. It is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not right for the soldier to apply for arrears. He knew the existence of the law, and why should he be allowed now to come in and make a demand for $4,000, $5,000 or $6,000 for the twenty years last past, thus throwing upon the Government an enormous demand which he refused for twenty years even to present? I believe the assertion of this enormous claim at this time against the Government of the United States will be embarrassing even to the people of the United States. It would break down all restrictions upon claims hereafter. Executive officers of the Government can estimate and provide ample revenues to meet existing laws, but no sagacity would enable Congress to provide for claims not presented when payable, and asserted only at a period of hardship to the amount of $246,000,000. There is no equity in it."

It seems incredible that such a gigantic grab can stand any chance of success, but that there is real danger appears clearly enough from the fact that the man who thus showed the injustice of the proposition only two years ago, has announced his purpose to support it now.

The Southern members of Congress have it in their power to render the country a great service in this matter. If the South will only be "solid" against this steal, we think that enough Northern members will be found possessed of sufficient independence to stand with them and secure its defeat. The New Orleans *Times-Democrat* published an editorial article upon this subject the other day, which concluded with this excellent advice to Southern Congressmen:

"The Southern Congressmen can do much good here if they would. They have hitherto generally voted in favor of these pension bills because they believed Northern sentiment favored these measures. If they will look outside of Congress they will find that it does not; that the North feels that the country has done enough already for its soldiery, and would call a halt in pensions. Let the Southern Representatives aid in relieving the country from any increased burden, simply to advance the interests and aid the Presidential aspirations of a lot of demagogues who are trying to buy votes for themselves by passing additional pension bills."

Every word of this is true, and we hope that the Southern press will be unanimous in urging such views.

The Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections has made a favorable report upon the proposition to change the date for the inauguration of the President and the opening of a Congressional term from the 4th of March to the 30th of April, beginning with 1889. There are strong arguments in favor of the proposed change. It would extend the length of the short session of every Congress to reasonable limits; it would place inauguration day at the most agreeable season of the whole year in Washington, instead of the most inclement; it would very likely save some future President from being killed by exposure to the peculiarly severe weather which so often attends the inaugural ceremonies, and which has slain so many chilled spectators of the display, as notably when Grant began his second term; and it would be a peculiarly appropriate way of celebrating the hundredth anniversary of the day when Washington became President. No valid reason against the change has been adduced by anybody. The Senate is expected to follow the lead of its committee in endorsing the proposition, and the House ought to concur. If the amendment gets through Congress, there can be no question of its ratification by the States.

"The official burial of the Confederacy," as somebody has happily styled the ceremonies attending the laying of the corner-stone of a soldiers' monument at Montgomery, Alabama, last week, has been accompanied by high-flown funeral eulogies of the deceased, based naturally upon the maxim *nil de mortuis nisi bonum*. But everybody knows that the Southern people have become convinced that it was best for them, as well as for the rest of us, that the lost cause was lost, and that their applause of the chief of the Confederate States from 1861 to 1865 implies no disloyalty to the United States in 1886. Indeed, there is little to complain of in the attitude of Jeff Davis himself when he can end his funeral oration over the grave of the Confederacy with such words as these:

"In conclusion, permit me to say, though the memory of our glorious past must ever be dear to us, duty points to the present and the future. Alabama having resumed her place in the Union, be it yours to fulfil all the obligations devolving upon all good citizens, seeking to restore the general Government to its pristine purity, and, as best you may, to promote the welfare and happiness of your common country."

It was quite natural that John Sherman should have welcomed the Jeff Davis incident as a piece of good fortune for Republican politicians lacking an "issue" for the fall campaign, since the Ohio Senator has always clung hard to the bloody shirt. Mr. Sherman broke forth the other day in the familiar old strain, as follows:

"Davis is a monumental fool, a vain and disappointed old man, posing as a martyr, grieving over his failures, and appealing for sympathy. What he says is of no particular consequence. Everybody knows that he has felt just as he talks all the while, but the significant part of it all lies in the manner in which his words are received by the people, the demonstrations of approval, the enthusiasm they create. That is what will affect the loyal element of the country, and make the blood of those who fought to save the Union boil with indignation."

But, unfortunately for the Ohio Republican, there came the very next day this unanswerable explanation of what the demonstration really means from that representative Southern Republican, General Longstreet, of Georgia:

"This occasion is a revival of a harmless but beautiful sentiment. The old soldiers wanted to get together again, and this was perhaps the best occasion for a meeting. It means no disrespect to any other section of the country, nor is there an evidence of disloyalty in the display. We all recognize that the war is over, and that all the questions then submitted for decision to the sword are forever settled. Mr. Davis growing old, the people were anxious to see him once again, and this was the best time to do it. Probably it is his last appearance among us. That is all this demonstration means, and the right to this celebration by both the young and the old will everywhere be acknowledged. It means nothing more than a reunion of old comrades and the revival of never-fading memories."

It was pointed out some time ago that it was only a step for the Knights of Labor from dictating whom an employer shall hire and how long he shall keep his establishment open, to demanding absolute control of his business, and that this step was sure to be taken if the first interference were not resisted. The prophecy is already fulfilled in eastern Massachusetts, where the sway of this new despotism has gone longest unchallenged. A few weeks ago the Knights decided that the stores in Lynn must be closed at a certain hour, and the proprietors actually obeyed the insolent demand—or, rather, all of them except one man named Tarbox, who thinks this a free country, and is bringing his fellows to a sense of shame. Encouraged by their success in forcing stores to close at a certain hour, the Knights of Labor in the same region have now, very naturally, concluded to fix the rate of profits which storekeepers shall be allowed to make. The Boston *Transcript* of Friday evening publishes in its editorial columns the statement that demands have been made of certain shopkeepers in the suburbs of that city, that they furnish to a committee of Knights of Labor their invoices and price-lists, in order that the Committee may regulate the profits. After the pusillanimous surrender by all but one of the Lynn storekeepers of all control over the question when they should close their shops, we should not have been surprised to hear that this demand for a surrender of all control over their business had been entertained; but the Tarbox incident appears to have had its effect outside of Lynn, and the *Transcript* says that the suburban shop-keepers "have had the good sense and spirit to treat the demands with the contempt they merit."

The utterly illogical nature of many of the strikes during the present epidemic is curiously illustrated by a case just reported from Newark. In that city there are two morning papers, printed in the German language, which appear to have been paying their compositors liberal wages. On Sunday the men struck for an advance. The proprietor of one paper yielded. The manager of the other showed his books to the men, and demonstrated that it would be impossible to pay higher rates for composition. He offered to give the entire income of the paper to the printers—they to handle and control the paper and do all the business for three months, he to receive nothing. This offer was refused, the men demanding the increase or nothing. The manager thereupon secured the services of three printers to get out a small sheet the next day, to be the last number published. It will be seen that the strikers have won a great success; they demanded "a raise or nothing," and their demand has been acceded to.

The members of the Central Labor Union had an animated discussion on Sunday over the expediency of having a bill introduced at Albany for the repeal of the section of the Penal Code on "conspiracy." It was concluded, however, that such a step would be futile, since the members of the Legislature were but the tools of cowardly capitalists, and it would be beneath the dignity of laborers to appeal to them for help. It occurred to some of them that such a bill would be a confession that boycotting was conspiracy within the meaning of the law, and that it would not be wise to make that while so many cases were pending trial. It was finally concluded to engage the services of Gen. Roger A. Pryor to defend the indicted boycotters, with a request that he insist upon a jury made up entirely of workingmen. The childlike simplicity of all these utterances ought to be sufficient to convince every blatant "friend of the workingmen" of the crime

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which he commits in deceiving them with false doctrines.

The extreme uncertainty of temper and judgment that marks the support which our esteemed contemporary the *Times* gives even the best of causes, was curiously illustrated in its comments on the recent presentment of the Grand Jury about boycotting. The Grand Jury has been dealing during the last thirty days with a new and alarming form of crime, which is already affecting the industry of the whole country most seriously, and filling the lives of great numbers of humble people with terror, and nevertheless has the cowardly connivance or support of a large part of the daily press. In denouncing it in vigorous language, thus reassuring good citizens and reminding the officers of the law of their duty, the Grand Jury rendered a service to the community almost as great as the indictment of the offenders—a service all the more praiseworthy because most grand juries speak with bated breath and in uncertain tones. The *Times*, however, even at this crisis, found little to say about the presentment, except that the rhetoric was bad, and one or two of the images rather violent, and gravely announces that these errors have brought the Grand Jury "into ridicule and contempt." It could hardly render better service to the rioters and boycotters, and do more to discourage future grand juries in dealing with them.

The fact that boycotting is illegal has been grasped in Connecticut, where the law upon the subject is found to be similar to that of New York and other States. A "Walking Delegate" has been arrested in New Haven for attempting to intimidate a business firm who were advertising in the *Journal and Courier*, which is under a boycott for not employing union printers. The law under which the arrest is made is almost identical with section 653 of our Penal Code, entitled "Coercion," and is as follows:

"Every person who shall threaten or use any means to intimidate any person, to compel such person against his will to do or abstain from doing any act which such person has a legal right to do, or shall persistently follow such person in a disorderly manner, or injure or threaten to injure his property with intent to intimidate him, shall, upon conviction, be liable to a fine not exceeding $100, or imprisonment in the county jail six months."

The judge overruled a demurrer interposed in behalf of the "Walking Delegate," and in giving his decision declared that it was the plain intent of the statute "to punish the use of threats or any means of intimidation to compel any person against his will to do or abstain from doing any legal act"; that the threat to boycott "is, in the opinion of the Court a threat to do an illegal act well calculated to intimidate, and, further, that all confederacies whatsoever to the prejudice of a third party are highly criminal under the common law."

The French Penal Code, Art. 414, deals thus with boycotting and other intimidation:

"Is punishable with not less than six days' or more than three years' imprisonment, and a fine of not less than 16 francs or more than 3,000, whoever by means of violence, assaults, threats, or fraudulent pretences, shall set on foot or maintain, or try to maintain, a concerted cessation of labor, with the design of compelling an increase or diminution of wages, or interfering with the free exercise of industry or labor."

Mr. Gladstone's manifesto to the Midlothian electors is in reality an appeal to the English people for support against the class opposition which he is encountering in the Liberal ranks, and strikes the democratic note more distinctly than any other speech or document he has ever put forth. Nothing he has produced, too, has ever surpassed it in that happy union of fire and force for which he has long been famous. The strongest points he makes against the seceders are their total failure to agree on any substitute for his scheme, combined with their concession that some substitute there must be. This absence of any rival policy was made painfully apparent in the debates, and, coupled with the admission that something in the way of local self-government was absolutely needed, seems likely to cover up most of the defects in the Gladstone bill, and give the battle to his hands. In this manifesto he has made the most of this weakness of his opponents, and has been almost equally effective in pointing out the probability that what is refused to the Irish now, in a time of calm and conciliation, will, as on so many other occasions before, have to be granted in a time of danger and stress and under compulsion. The fury which the document has excited in the Tory ranks is the best measure of its destructiveness. Some of the judgments passed on it are very amusing specimens of "journalism." One paper makes it the "wail of an unresting spirit tortured with gloomy forebodings." Another treats it as "an appeal to man's basest and most sordid passions," and maintains that "its flagrant immorality will unseal the eyes of his most infatuated supporters." In the early days of the newspaper press, when the London *Times* was called "the Thunderer," this sort of writing used to be effective, but it is now generally amusing.

The reference of the manifesto to the Land Purchase Bill makes it seem probable that Mr. Gladstone will throw that overboard if hard pressed, and lay the blame on the Irish landlords themselves, for not rallying more vigorously, or indeed rallying at all, to its support. But although it may be true that the English are fairly responsible to the Irish landlords for the security of their estates, owing to their having so long enabled them to maintain their peculiar tenures in defiance of Irish opinion, nevertheless, it is almost impossible to defend both the Home-Rule Bill and the Land-Purchase Bill at the same time. One of the arguments in support of the Home-Rule Bill is that the Irish may be safely trusted with the protection in Ireland of all rights of property or person. But the chief argument in support of the Land-Purchase Bill is that the landlords' property would not be safe in the power of an Irish Parliament. Either of these positions may be true; both cannot be. In other words, if what is said in favor of the Home-Rule Bill be sound, the Land-Purchase Bill is unnecessary; but if the Land-Purchase Bill be necessary, then the Home-Rule Bill is a dangerous measure.

The *Herald* distinctly declares that "neither the Commons nor the Lords can settle the Irish question." This is likely to prove very embarrassing in practice, and may work serious delay, because no other instrumentality for the settlement as yet exists. But the readiness of our contemporary to interfere in these foreign disputes makes us all the more curious to know why it refused to settle the Third Avenue Railroad trouble.

The Marquis of Lorne deemed himself qualified the other day to interpret the public sentiment of the United States and Canada on the question of Irish home rule. So he wrote a letter to the newspapers saying that all parties in America found it necessary to cultivate the Irish vote, and that the resolutions of sympathy with Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Parnell, passed by public meetings and by State legislatures, were to be taken merely as the bids of politicians for the next election. The unvarnished truth is, that the resolution and the telegram adopted at the meeting in Washington City on Wednesday week, presided over by ex-Speaker Randall, which extended cordial good wishes to Gladstone and Parnell, "in their peaceful efforts to secure local government to the people of Ireland," do represent the feelings of all except the merest handful of the American people. There are well-considered objections to the official expression of opinion by one country upon the internal affairs of another and friendly country. Hence we should regret any introduction of this subject into Congress. But there can be no objection to unofficial and temperate expression of a sympathy which everybody feels. The Washington meeting was in good taste and had nothing in it of a partisan character. Indeed, it would be impossible for any political party to gain an advantage when all parties and persons feel the same emotions and think the same thoughts.

The appearance of Mr. Goldwin Smith on the scene in England to denounce home rule and Gladstone, on behalf both of the Canadians and "the bulk of the Americans," is likely to add fresh horrors to the scene of strife. It is not often that the scholar in politics occupies a position of such fearful responsibility as Mr. Goldwin Smith has taken on himself. We regret to say we think he is abusing his trust. The real sentiments of "the bulk of the Americans" on the Irish question must have been communicated to him in confidence, with instructions to tell no one, because their open professions are all the other way. To go and blurt it all out this way, both to the English and Irish, is an indiscretion from which Mr. Goldwin Smith will not readily recover. The Americans will never trust him again. The only way he can atone for it is to die on the field in conquering the Irish, in the same rank with Mr. Froude and the Duke of Westminster. There will be, when the fight comes, a sickening scene of carnage where these warriors stand.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SUMMARY OF THE WEEK'S NEWS.

WEDNESDAY, April 28, to TUESDAY, May 4, 1886, inclusive.]

DOMESTIC.

THE President on Friday nominated Joseph C. Hendrix for Postmaster at Brooklyn, N. Y. He is a graduate of Cornell, Secretary of the Brooklyn Bridge Company, and was a candidate for Mayor of Brooklyn against Mr. Low.

Baltimore was surprised on Friday by the resignation of I. P. Veazey, the new Postmaster. He gives as his reason the demands of his private business, but it is said he is tired of having to supply places to the Gorman crowd. His successor is Frank Brown, a young lawyer in good practice, who has been President of the Maryland Agricultural and Mechanical Association for several years, and has always been conspicuous in agricultural affairs.

The Senate has confirmed the nomination of Mr. Burnett as Mr. Duskin's successor in the office of District Attorney for Alabama, thus wholly setting aside the Edmunds resolutions.

The Senate Committee on Commerce on Thursday voted to make a favorable report on a new Atlantic and Pacific Ship Railway Bill as a substitute for the original Ship Bill, providing as follows: Eads and such others as may be associated with him are created a body corporate with the title of the Atlantic and Pacific Ship Railway Company, with power to issue capital stock and bonds not to exceed in the aggregate one hundred millions. The United States obligates itself to pay said company, for a period of five years after the ship railway shall have been completed and tested, any sums of money required to make two-thirds of the net revenues of said company amount annually to the sum of $3,500,000, provided that the total liability of the Government shall in no case exceed the sum of $7,500,000. The obligation of the United States shall not attach until the railway shall have transported, in the presence of a board of engineers appointed by the President of the United States, a loaded vessel weighing with her load not less than 6,000 tons, at an average speed of not less than six miles an hour, and place her in the harbor at the other side of the isthmus without injury to the vessel.

In the House on Thursday Mr. Lanham (Dem., Tex.), from the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, reported a bill for the retirement and recoinage of trade dollars. It provides that for six months after its passage trade dollars shall be received at their face value in payment of all dues to the United States, and shall not be again paid out or issued in any other manner. Holders of trade dollars, on presentation of the same, may receive in exchange therefor an equal amount of standard silver dollars. The trade dollars so received by the United States Treasury officials shall be transmitted to the coinage mints and recoined into standard silver dollars.

The reduction in the public debt during April was $10,965,387 95.

The great strike on the Gould railroad lines in the Southwest has finally ended in the acknowledged failure of the Knights of Labor. The General Executive Board of the Knights of Labor issued, on Monday, a circular to the District Assemblies, in which they said that they had received a letter from the Congressional Committee investigating the strike, saying: "'The testimony taken by the Congressional Investigating Committee shows conclusively that very serious losses to the commercial interests of the entire country have resulted from this trouble, and that a large number of persons not connected therewith have been thrown out of employment.' Therefore, they 'do respectfully but earnestly ask you to discontinue the strike, and leave the justice of your cause to the decision that public opinion may form when we make our report.' The document was fully considered and the following conclusion arrived at: 'That the matter be left in the hands of the General Executive Board, they to set a time and declare the strike at an end.' We have therefore selected Tuesday, May 4, 1886, as the time when this strike shall end. You will make application to your former employers for employment on the above date, Tuesday morning, May 4." Accordingly, on Tuesday many of the strikers applied for work and were generally received, though those who committed depredations were refused employment.

John Givens, a striker in St. Louis, was shot dead on Wednesday night by W. E. Withers, an employee of the Bridge and Tunnel Company, whom Givens assaulted after advising him to quit work and leave town.

The managers of all the railroads centring in Chicago held a meeting on Monday at the Burlington general office to consider the strike of the freight-handlers. An informal interchange of ideas relative to the situation finally culminated in the adoption of a resolution, that the present condition of business did not warrant any advance in the wages now paid to employees; that the roads pledge themselves to act as a unit in the matter, and resist all demands for shorter hours or advance in wages, agreeing not to treat individually or make concessions not approved of by all.

The movement for eight hours as a day's labor was actively carried out in many cities on May 1st. It was strongest in Chicago. It is estimated that 30,000 workmen were idle in that city on Saturday. All trades were affected, especially at lumber yards, railway depots, and furniture factories.

On Monday the streets of Chicago were filled with idle men, who were, however, orderly and quiet during the morning. Several of the roads whose freight-handlers had struck resumed working with new men. Lumbermen, metal-workers, and furniture men were mostly idle. About 40,000 men were out. The Wabash Railway officials sought the protection of the United States authorities to enable them to move freight. Several manufactories, including the McCormick reaper works, yielded to the demands of the men. In other cities the movement was not so extended. In Washington 3,000 men were idle. In New York city the demand has been made by many employees, but there are few strikes and no disorders. A number of firms have consented to eight hours' work and eight hours' pay.

There was a riot in Chicago on Monday afternoon. A crowd of some 7,000 or 8,000 Anarchists, workmen, and tramps assailed the McCormick Reaper Works because it was supposed that the men there would work ten hours. In fact, however, eight hours had been agreed to. The mob attacked the workmen with stones, and threw stones through the windows of the works. When a platoon of police arrived the mob attacked them, first with stones and then with revolvers. The police held their ground and returned the fire. Several of the rioters were hurt, and finally the police charged and scattered them. A dozen arrests were made. One striker was fatally injured.

At Chicago on Tuesday morning comparative quiet prevailed, though the police dispersed several mobs of idlers and made a number of arrests. The McCormick works opened as usual in the morning, fully one-half of their men resuming work under police protection. It was announced on Tuesday that a number of pork-packing houses had yielded to the demands of the men.

On Tuesday afternoon a handbill in Chicago, printed in German and English, called upon "workingmen" to meet at Desplaines and Randolph Streets in the evening. "Good speakers," it was promised, "will be present to denounce the latest atrocious act of the police—the shooting of our fellow-workmen yesterday afternoon." Some 1,400 persons gathered there, but the speeches were dull, and half the crowd had left when Sam Fielding, an Anarchist leader, took the stand and shouted out the most incendiary utterances. He finally became so violent that word was sent to the station, and Inspector Bonfield, at the head of 125 men, marched to the place. Bonfield called upon the crowd to disperse, and Fielding shouted out from the wagon: "To arms!" The officer once more called on them to disperse, when suddenly from behind the wagon, which was not fifteen feet from the front rank of the police, one dynamite bomb (or more) was thrown in between the second and third ranks of the officers. The effect was terrible. Thirty-three policemen were cut down, about half-a-dozen fatally wounded. Immediately after the explosion the officers who were left standing drew their revolvers and fired round after round into the mob. Probably fifty of the mob fell, and as they dropped were immediately carried to the rear and into the many dark alleyways by their friends. In the afternoon a mob attacked a paint-shop in Centre Avenue, and was only dispersed by a vigorous charge by the police.

At Milwaukee on Monday afternoon a similar collision occurred between a mob of Poles and the police. Nobody was killed. The uneasiness continued on Tuesday. More than 7,000 idle workmen had gathered at Bay View, threatening the rolling mills. Governor Rusk of Wisconsin ordered out a number of militia companies. A mob was dispersed during the day by a volley fired over their heads.

The Grand Jury in this city on Thursday indicted five members of the Executive Committee of the Empire Protective Association for conspiracy and coercion in causing the strike on the Third Avenue Road by ordering the discharge of the five drivers and two conductors who were not members of the Union, and for interfering with the running of other horse railroads in the city by ordering the general tie-up on Monday, the 19th ult. Chairman Joseph P. O'Donnell is one of those indicted.

The Oregon Republicans have nominated T. R. Cornelius for Governor.

The enthusiastic reception of Jefferson Davis in the South has been made the text for "bloody-shirt" speeches and articles in the North. A close examination of the Southern papers shows that their sentiments are eminently loyal. Where the demonstration is approved it is as a personal compliment to Mr. Davis, and in memory of the Confederate dead. Commenting on the Montgomery celebration, the Vicksburg *Commercial Herald*, the leading Democratic morning paper of Mississippi, says: "Mr. Jefferson Davis is not of the new South. He is of the old South. He said things at Montgomery that would have been better unsaid, and did not say things he, of all men, ought to have said."

Mr. Davis delivered his address at the laying of the corner stone of the Confederate monument in Montgomery, Ala., on Thursday amid great enthusiasm. "I have come to join you," he said, "in the performance of a sacred task, to lay the foundation of a monument at the cradle of the Confederate Government, which shall commemorate the gallant sons of Alabama who died for their country, who gave their lives a free-will offering in defence of the rights of their sires won in the war of the Revolution, and the State sovereignty, freedom, and independence which was left as an inheritance to their posterity forever. These rights the compact of union was formed not to destroy, but the better to preserve and perpetuate. Who denies this cannot have attentively read the Articles of Confederation or the Constitution of the United States." In closing he said: "Permit me to say, though the memory of our glorious past must ever be dear to us, duty points to the present and future. Alabama having resumed her place in the Union, be it yours to fulfil all the obligations devolving upon all good citizens seeking to restore the general Government to its pristine

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

purity, and as best you may to promote the welfare and happiness of your common country."

Henry Hobson Richardson, the eminent architect, died near Boston on Wednesday, aged about forty-eight. He was graduated at Harvard, and received his art education at the École des Beaux Arts, in Paris. Many costly and monumental public buildings of great merit, of which Trinity Church, Boston, is a conspicuous example, entitled him to rank as the head of his profession.

FOREIGN.

Michael Davitt, in a speech at Birmingham on Wednesday night, said that Mr. Chamberlain had tried to justify his attitude toward the Irish bills by a most inconsistent argument, and he quoted a passage from a speech made by Mr. Chamberlain at Sheffield, in which the latter favored Mr. Butt's scheme and the removal of the Irish representatives from Westminster.

In a speech at Glasgow on Friday night, Mr. John Morley said in regard to the difficulty about Irish representation at Westminster: "The difficulty can be met by some such suggestion as I ventured to make in the House of Commons. What I ventured to suggest has since been supported by a man of greater authority and experience in the House than I. It was, for two or three years to let Ireland get the benefit of all the faculty and all the capacity of Ireland to set this new machinery a-going. If at the end of these two or three or five years there is then a desire felt or expressed on the part of the Irish people to revert once more to their old position, whether in reduced numbers or otherwise, at Westminster, I think it would be an arrangement which all Englishmen and Scotchmen might most gladly fall in with, and against which no Irishman would have very much to say." This is a hint that the Government is ready to modify the scheme on this important point.

Lord Iddesleigh (Sir Stafford Northcote) in an address at Plymouth asked the Conservatives, in consideration of the fact that a large part of the Liberal party was unable to agree with the Ministry, to refrain from abusing Mr. Gladstone.

A two-column manifesto from Mr. Gladstone to his Midlothian constituents was published on Monday morning. He explains that his great age has prevented his taking part in the speeches of the Easter recess, and has obliged him to reserve his limited powers for the House of Commons, and for that reason he uses his pen instead of his voice. He gives a long history of the attempts to conciliate and coerce Ireland, and, referring to the present conflict, says: "On the side adverse to the Government are found, as I sorrowfully admit, in profuse abundance, station, title, wealth, social influence, and the professions, or the large majority of them—in a word, the spirit and power of class. These are the main body of the opposing host." Explaining his aim he says: "It is to restore your Parliament to efficacy by dividing and by removing obstacles to its work; to treat the Irish question with a due regard to its specialties, but with the same thoroughness of method by which we have solved colonial problems that fifty years back were hardly, if at all, less formidable."

"Now, however," he adds, "a new terror is brought upon the stage—the terror of home rule for Scotland, and some add for Wales. This suggestion does not alarm me. Only give us a little time to look at this question in its order of merit. I am not sorry that Scotland and Wales have been named, because all serious naming of them serves to help our movement on behalf of Ireland. I can draw no vital distinction of right between the case of Ireland and the other cases, but there are many distinctions of circumstance. For many years I have hoped it might be found practicable to apply decentralizing processes, even, perhaps, to portions of different conditions. Each case, which will naturally require differences of treatment, will remain subject to the primary imperial obligations. I believe that the standard and measure of good government in Scotland and Wales will be eventually determined by public opinion in Scotland and Wales. But this formidable army which opposes the Government is in bulk and constituent parts the same, though now enriched at our cost with a valuable contingent of recruits that has fought in every political battle of the last sixty years and been defeated. We have before this had great controversies on free trade, free navigation, public education, religious equality, and the extension of the franchise. On these and other great issues this class fought uniformly on the wrong side, and was uniformly beaten by a power more difficult to marshal, but resistless when marshalled—by the upright sense of the nation. The power of gross and wholesale insult emboldens some, but only some, and not, I rejoice to think, the nations of Scotland or England. Lord Hartington reminded us, and I cordially agree with him, that this question, which may be turned over a thousand ways and placed in a thousand partial lights, can only be settled by the nation. From the first I stated, and I think I may speak for the Government at large, that here is my main and capital reliance. I rely upon my colleagues, upon an upright and enlightened House of Commons, upon the effect of free discussion; but the heart, the root, the beginning and the ending of my trust is in the wise and generous justice of the nation."

The following paragraphs of the manifesto are significant of Mr. Gladstone's attitude toward the Land-Purchase Bill, and his probable willingness to amend the Home-Rule Bill: "I speak now of the Home-Rule Bill, and leave the Land-Purchase Bill to stand on the declaration already made, adding only an expression of regret to find that, while the sands are running from the hour-glass, the Irish landlords have given no indication of a desire to accept the proposal framed in a spirit of the utmost allowable regard for their apprehensions and interest. . . . We are not now debating the amount of the Irish contributions to the empire, or the composition of the legislative body, or the maintenance of a representative connection with Westminster. On these and many more questions we may and may not be at odds. But what we are debating is the larger question which includes, I think absorbs, them all—the question whether you will or will not have regard to the prayer of Ireland for the management of affairs specifically and exclusively her own. This and no other is the matter which the House of Commons has to decide."

Many of Mr. Gladstone's stanchest supporters openly express the conviction that the Land-Purchase Bill will be dropped. The manifesto is taken to indicate that large concessions will be made to Mr. Chamberlain in return for the support of wavering Liberals, in order to carry the Home-Rule Bill through its second reading. The Conservatives believe that the manifesto will increase the opposition to the measure.

Statistics show that during the last three months 698 families, comprising 3,477 persons, were evicted from holdings in Ireland. During the same period 256 outrages were committed.

The death is announced of the Earl of Redesdale, Chairman of Committees and Deputy Speaker of the House of Lords since 1851. The Earl of Redesdale was born in Ireland in 1805. His father was once Lord Chancellor of Ireland. He succeeded his father as Baron Redesdale in 1830, and was made an earl in 1876. The late earl was an inveterate pamphleteer. He was strongly opposed to the disestablishment of the Irish Church. He was a Tory of the old school, and came into prominence in this country by his remarkable speeches on the *Alabama* claims question. His personal appearance was notably eccentric.

Queen Victoria formally opened the Colonial Exhibition in London on Tuesday. She was greeted with enthusiasm. A prominent feature of the opening ceremonies was the Ode composed for the occasion by Lord Tennyson. This was magnificently rendered by a vast choir of carefully selected voices. The Ode was sung just previous to the Queen's formal declaration that the exhibition was open. The music was by Sir Arthur Sullivan. One stanza was sung in Sanskrit, in deference to the Imperial idea.

The Greek Minister of War resigned on Thursday because he did not coincide with the action taken by his colleagues during his absence at the front. The Powers have approved the action of their representatives in Athens in presenting the ultimatum to the Greek Government.

Greece, in her reply delivered on Thursday to the ultimatum of the Powers ordering her to disarm within eight days, points to the fact that she had notified the Powers prior to the receipt of their ultimatum that she had accepted the counsel of France, thus giving formal assurance that, yielding to the desire of the Powers, she would not disturb the peace. Consequently she will maintain her armaments, but will gradually reduce them. Greece trusts, the answer adds, that the ultimatum of the Powers will be now regarded as having no further object. The foreign Ministers in Athens, on receiving the reply of Greece, referred it to their respective Governments, from whom they awaited instructions before answering it.

The Greek Government decided on Monday that its reply already made to the ultimatum of the Powers was sufficient, and that the promises contained therein were all it could make. The ministers of the Powers prepared to embark on the allied fleet, but were instructed on Tuesday to remain at their posts.

It is believed that the Powers will accept a guarantee from France that she will secure the disarmament of Greece, and that they will not fix an actual period for its accomplishment.

There is serious dissension in the Spanish Cabinet. The friction is due to the refusal of the other Ministers to yield to the demands of Señor Camacho, the Minister of Finance, for economy in the budget, which he insists is necessary.

The Prussian Government, fearing that strikes are impending, has issued a decree ordering the police to interfere in case strikers intimidate workmen. Socialist meetings and publications will be put under energetic surveillance.

The French have suppressed the revolt of natives in Senegal.

Another attempt to burn Mandalay, Burmah, was made on Thursday. The damage is considerable.

A pastoral letter was received in Montreal on Wednesday from Cardinal Taschereau, condemning the Knights of Labor as a secret organization inimical to the interests of religion and good morals. Great efforts had been made by the local officers of the order to influence the Cardinal and prevent the issuing of this pastoral. The Cardinal, it is understood, before issuing it conferred with all the provincial bishops, who all agree with his decision.

The Grand Vicar Marshal of the Bishop's Palace in Montreal is authority for the statement that at the Consistory in June next, to be held in Rome, the Pope will issue a bull absolutely condemning and excommunicating all the Knights of Labor.

The report that an American fishing vessel had been seized at Baddeck, Cape Breton, for infringement of the fishing laws, was incorrect. The Dominion Collector of Customs says that an American schooner in the Bras d'Or Lake was examined on suspicion of irregularity in her papers, but, the cargo and clearances being found to agree, she was allowed to proceed on her voyage.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DEMOCRATS AND MUGWUMPS.

A LETTER from Washington in the Springfield *Republican*, probably written by Mr. Samuel Bowles, discussing the President's attitude toward the leaders of the Democratic party on the one hand and toward civil-service reform on the other, has attracted the lively interest of the Republican newspapers, and has led the Philadelphia *Press* to remark that "the result of one year of a reform Democratic Mugwump Administration is profound discontent among the Democrats, and dissatisfaction among the Mugwumps. The result," it continues, "is exactly what was predicted when it was claimed that, however sincere Cleveland might be himself, he would be unable to stand up against the bad tendencies of his own party."

Mr. Bowles's letter is for the most part a narrative of facts that came under his observation in Washington, with here and there an opinion of his own as to what might better have been done. The line between his facts and his opinions is not in all cases so clearly drawn as would be desirable, but there is a clear division of the subject treated into two parts, viz.: the discontent of the Democratic leaders with so much of civil-service reform as the President has insisted upon, and the discontent of the Independents with the infractions, or supposed infractions, of principle which have been committed by the President, or by his subordinates with his consent. As to the former of these two difficulties, Mr. Bowles says in substance that there is a great deal of complaint among Democrats that the President has not formulated a policy, or rather a lot of policies, and put them through as a party chief should do; that he has housed himself in the Executive Mansion, and allowed things to take their own course, and that consequently the party is drifting like a ship without rudder or compass. This is the complaint made in Washington wherever two or three Democratic Congressmen are gathered together. It signifies simply that Congressmen are not allowed to have the offices they want or as many as they want. To whatever extent this discontent exists, civil-service reform has got in their way and has blocked their game.

The dissatisfied Democrats, as well as other people, know that our form of government does not contemplate that the President shall formulate the policy of his party, or provide machinery for his doing so, in any other way than by making recommendations to Congress in writing from time to time. They know, and all know, that having a policy and "putting it through" means, so far as the President is concerned, using the offices as bribes to secure the votes of some and as whips to punish the obstinacy of others. There is no other significance to the phrase in this country of ours. This view is abundantly sustained by political history. The only Presidents during this generation who have had policies to "put through" were Andrew Johnson and General Grant. Both made lamentable failures, and both failed to put through the policies which they had at heart. Both Johnson and Grant used the patronage of the Government for all that it would bring—the one to carry out his ideas of Southern Reconstruction, and the other to secure the annexation of San Domingo. They demoralized the public service to an unheard-of degree, produced incurable dissensions in their party, and in the end failed. Now what would have happened if Mr. Cleveland had gone to Washington with the purpose to "put through" a repeal of the Silver Bill, or a revision of the tariff, or to carry out any policy which required votes in Congress? After recommending to Congress the measures he desired to have adopted, as he has done, there would be no recourse but to say to reluctant members: "Here are so many offices at your disposal if you vote for my measures. If you do not so vote, they will be given to your rivals and enemies in your own districts, and if you have any friends in office now, they will be put out." This is the lowest form of public debauchery. It would have ruined Mr. Cleveland as it ruined his party predecessors, Pierce and Buchanan, and it would have failed utterly, as it did in their cases, to accomplish the end sought to be gained.

Now, what have the Mugwumps to say? They perceive, in the first place, that, to whatever extent Democratic discontent exists, it exists because civil-service reform has found a lodgment in the White House. There is no complaint that Mr. Cleveland has violated any principle held dear by the Democratic party. It is not alleged that he has gone counter to the Democratic platform or to the pledges made before his election. The only complaint from that quarter is that he has not cut up and served out the public patronage fast enough. This is not a complaint that grieves any Mugwump. On the other hand, there is a complaint that the President has come short in some rather glaring cases of the terms of the letter which he voluntarily addressed to Mr. Curtis on Christmas day, 1884. This is a subject which we have discussed from time to time, and which we shall reserve for separate treatment. There is also a complaint that the Civil-Service Reform Law has been violated in some places, notably in Baltimore and Indianapolis. These appear to be two very rotten spots. Now, the violation of a statute of the United States is a much graver matter than differences of opinion concerning a voluntary pledge, as to which there may be much latitude of interpretation. Such violation cannot be tolerated here and there by those who have civil-service reform at heart any more than counterfeiting can be tolerated here and there by banks. We believe that it will not be tolerated by the President if the facts shall show that an infraction of law has been committed, or that its spirit has been violated by any person who holds his commission. At all events, the Republican press may rest assured that no pains will be spared by the Mugwumps to find out the facts, and that there will be no hesitancy on their part in proclaiming them.

THE LESSONS OF THE STRIKES.

THE railroad strikes may now be considered for all practical purposes at an end. They have caused a great deal of pecuniary loss to the corporations, to the workingmen, and to the business community. But they have been of inestimable value as a means of securing for the labor problem an amount and kind of discussion from all classes such as it never received before. Never before have the labor associations attracted so much attention to their aims and methods from others besides large employers. Never before has the public been brought to a thorough comprehension of the theory which underlies nearly all the strikes that take place in this country—the theory that the striking laborer has a moral right to be employed on his own terms in the place he has left. It is this theory that causes the resort to violence to which nearly every large strike of unskilled, or only slightly skilled, labor owes the smallest success. Not one of the recent railroad strikes would have delayed traffic for over a day or two but for the forcible resistance of the strikers to the conduct of the business by anybody but themselves. This forcible resistance is due almost wholly to the belief that when the member of a union gets a place in anybody's employment, he acquires a vested interest in it of which the employer has no right to deprive him. It is this which makes the members of all the unions sympathize either secretly or openly with the assaults and other acts of violence which accompany all the large strikes. They look on them as not wholly illegitimate attempts to defend a species of property. This theory has never before been as thoroughly examined by the public at large as it has been during the late troubles. In fact, there has been for a great many years a sort of ignorant or indifferent acquiescence in it. But this is at an end. It has been examined, and its absurdity made manifest, and a manifest absurdity does not live long in this country.

But there is another lesson, almost equally important, which we trust the strikes may bring home to railroad managers, both East and West. No matter how mischievous or how badly managed trade organizations may be, or how absurd the pretensions they make, their continuance and growth is certain. The individual laborer in any calling is, in these days of great accumulations of capital, very weak and helpless in his relations with the employer. He knows that combination with his fellows will give him strength in making his bargains and defending his rights, and therefore combine he will. But the very fact that these combinations are intended to make the weak strong, makes them also to a certain degree hostile to all excellence. They nearly all oppose bitterly any display of individual superiority. They nearly all see to it that unusual ingenuity, or skill, or diligence, or ambition, or industry shall not profit a man. They nearly all try to keep all the members down to the level of the most stupid, or slow, or indolent, or contented. In so far they are hostile to civilization itself, and are drags on the wheels of both moral and material progress. They cultivate deliberately, in spite of the professions of their documents, a rather low mental and moral type of man. But this makes it all the more important that the corporations and other great employers of labor who suffer from them, and who refuse to "recognize" them, should in their dealings with their own em-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ployees open up a more excellent way. If there be any one inference from the late labor troubles more palpable than another, it is that the great corporations should do more to raise the character of their own service, to infuse into their dealings with their employees something better than the spirit of contract or patronage merely. In other words, they should do something to make their men feel that the Union is not a necessity to them; that the employer will not take advantage of their weakness, and that the corps in which they work serves all the purposes of a trade-union, and does secure them kindly and considerate treatment, the best wages the market allows, and protection from arbitrary or hasty dismissal.

There is not a railroad in this country which might not by a little effort make its own service a sort of *corps d'élite*, which would attract the most capable and ambitious men, and in which there would be free play for talent and capacity. Some of them have done this, or made a very near approach to it already, but in a large number the managers care very little how the employees feel, as long as they do not strike, and do very little to make the service attractive to picked men. We believe that a change of policy in this respect would soon give us large bodies of laborers in all fields, who would be just as much ashamed to abandon their work, without knowing why, on seeing two fingers held up, or to pummel people who took their places, or picket or boycott their employer's premises, as clergymen, or lawyers, or doctors would be. Large numbers now live in slavery to the O'Donnells and Ironses simply because they cannot do better. Large numbers are doing poor work and keeping their best faculties dormant, under Union compulsion, simply because outside of the Union there is no sympathy or support or consideration for them to be found—nobody on whom they can count for help or counsel on dark and rainy days, and they fear to face the world absolutely alone with wives and children dependent on them.

A NEW WAY TO GET RID OF LABOR.

THE limitation of the time during which human beings shall be allowed to work to eight hours a day has been regarded hitherto as a somewhat visionary scheme. Economic progress in one sense has consisted in the attainment of given results with a diminished expenditure of labor; natural forces have been brought in to do the work of man. But the increase of wealth has been due to the fact that the labor thus set free has been reëmployed, so that our progress would be more correctly described as consisting in the attainment of greater results with a given expenditure of labor. Every one would be glad if progress could be maintained with less labor than at present, but most persons are apprehensive that if the day's work should be reduced to eight hours, a serious check would be given to our prosperity.

It is highly gratifying, therefore, to come upon a demonstration that the industrial prosperity of the country, as well as the moral and social well-being of the laboring classes, will be promoted by this reduction of hours. Such a demonstration is furnished by a writer in the April number of the *Forum*, Mr. George Gunton. He estimates the number of "exclusively wage laborers" at 9,472,159—a number which we regret to see he arrives at by the exclusion of 1,075,655 domestic servants. It is notorious that the hours of this class of laborers are the longest of all, and that they are generally prevented from devoting themselves to moral and æsthetic culture by the exactions of their employers. The time that might be spent in attending lectures or concerts, or in visiting art galleries, is too often consumed in the wearisome occupation of washing dishes after the protracted orgies of capitalists have been concluded. But we pass on to Mr. Gunton's demonstration:

"Taking eleven hours to be the average length of the working-day, if an eight-hour system were adopted there would be a uniform reduction of three hours' labor a day, the effect of which upon the industrial and business interests of the community must be obvious. The first and immediate effect of such a measure would be to reduce the average daily production over one-fourth. In other words, the product of 28,416,477 hours' labor a day would be withdrawn from the market without discharging a single laborer. The commercial vacuum thus produced would, in its effect upon labor and business, be equal to increasing the present demand over one-fourth; that is to say, without increasing our home or foreign market, but simply to supply the present nominal consumption, it would create employment for 3,500,000 laborers. To meet this demand, about one-sixth more factories and workshops would be needed, besides setting our present machinery in operation; and a further demand for labor would be created in the mines, forges, furnaces, ironworks, and the various industries that contribute to the building and equipment of the requisite new factories and workshops. . . . Nor is this all. The new demand for labor thus created would necessarily increase the number of consumers, and thereby still further enlarge the demand for commodities; and, according to the popular doctrine of supply and demand, the increased demand for labor, by reducing competition among laborers, must tend to increase wages."

To the objection that if no more wealth is produced no more can be distributed, and that if more laborers are required to produce a given result, they will get lower wages, the reply is as follows: The extent of the market determines business prosperity. The extent of the market is governed by the consumption of wealth by the masses, and this by the standard of living, which in turn is the effect of the habits and customs or character of the people. Therefore whatever tends to increase the wants, improve the habits, and raise the standard of living of the masses, must necessarily tend permanently to increase the consumption and production of wealth.

"And this is precisely what, from the natural operation of economic forces, must result from the adoption of an eight-hour system. . . . The mass of laborers throughout the country, having three hours a day extra time for leisure and opportunity, and being less exhausted, mentally and physically, will be forced into more varied social relations—a new environment, the unconscious influence of which will naturally awaken and develop new desires and tastes that will slowly and surely crystallize into urgent wants and fixed habits, making a higher standard of living inevitable. . . . This increased consumption necessarily implies a corresponding increase in production; and consequently an increased demand for labor and higher wages. . . . It is therefore manifest that the general and permanent economic effect of an eight-hour system would be to naturally increase the aggregate consumption and production of wealth."

It is the mark of genius to discern great world-truths in the most commonplace events. Nothing is more common than to see men who are unemployed half the time, and the shallow philanthropy of the day deplores their condition. The folly of this is made apparent by this writer. These half-employed men have really "extra time for leisure and opportunity"; they are less exhausted mentally and physically, and they are forced into more varied social relations. The crystallization of their desires and tastes into urgent wants and fixed habits does not always, perhaps, make a higher standard of living inevitable. A desire for what one has not money to buy sometimes forces one into social relations with the officers of the law that are more varied than pleasant, and leads to a standard of living that is certainly "inevitable" without necessarily being higher. But this does not affect the fundamental truth, brought out so clearly by this philosopher, that the way to improve your condition is to increase your wants. It is important not to misunderstand this principle. Nothing is easier than to suppose that when a man feels his wants increasing he will work harder in order to obtain the means of gratifying them. But this is precisely the fallacy that the new doctrine is designed to explode. The true theory is, that if a man works less, his wants will tend to increase, and we believe that when attention has once been generally drawn to this principle it will be admitted as self-evident. Exactly how new wants are to be gratified merely because they come into existence, is, we are sorry to say, not made perfectly clear by Mr. Gunton, and this is a practical difficulty which has perplexed a great many people. But it is unreasonable to reject a novel theory merely because it does not satisfy every objector when it is first propounded. It is said that Hegel used to tell his students that in order to understand his philosophy they must stand on their heads. Something the same must be true of this new theory of the production of wealth, and doubtless after we have become accustomed to the aspect of things from this unusual position, many difficulties will resolve themselves.

It is seldom the case that the discoverer of a great principle foresees all its applications. No intelligent person, however, regards this circumstance as lessening the glory of discovery. The fame of Columbus is not diminished by the fact that he was in search, not of a new continent, but of a new way to an old one. He discovered America, and the critic would be indeed captious that should complain that the far-reaching consequences of this event were not at once perceived. We shall, therefore, not hesitate to point out some extensions of this new principle of wealth that may not have presented themselves to the mind of its discoverer.

Let us suppose that, instead of taking eight hours as the length of a day's labor, four hours be fixed upon. In that case the product, not of some 28,000,000 hours' labor a day, but of over 60,000,000 hours would be withdrawn from the market without discharging a single laborer. The commercial vacuum thus produced would, in its effect on business, be equal to increasing the present demand over one-half. It would create employment for over 7,000,000 laborers. To meet this demand, much more than one-sixth more factories and workshops would be needed, and a very active demand for labor

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would be created in the mines, forges, etc.; while this new demand for labor would necessarily enlarge the number of consumers and the demand for commodities. This increased demand for labor would obviously extinguish competition among laborers, and wages would therefore bound upwards. It is equally obvious that the wants of the masses would tend to increase even more if they worked only four hours instead of eight, and that the production and consumption of wealth would still more increase. If the mass of laborers had not three hours, but seven hours, a day "extra time for leisure and opportunity," they would be exhausted hardly at all, and the variety of social relations into which they would be forced would be almost inconceivable. So much "opportunity" would infallibly result in a gigantic crystallization of desires into urgent wants, and we are sure that a higher standard of living would become very soon inevitable. If it were postponed, the consequences might be such as we should not like to answer for.

We do not like either to carry a theory to extremes, or to seem to rob its propounder of the credit due to its complete development. It is sufficient, therefore, to suggest that the principle that we have considered may eventually lead to the entire extinction of the primeval curse of labor. We know of no reason why, if the reduction of the hours of labor—which, it is important to observe, means with Mr. Gunton a corresponding reduction of the amount of work performed—infallibly leads to an increased production of wealth, the condition of the race should not be infinitely improved by the general cessation of tiresome exertion. A standard of living would thus be brought about that would be almost inconceivably higher than the present one; a standard of living so high, indeed, that it is now supposed to be attainable only by angels, and in the attainment of which the wants of most men would become so urgent as to cause them to exchange the human for the angelic state of existence.

"READING NOTICES."

Our contemporary, the *Times*, has got into a position of some embarrassment from its practice of printing what are known in the trade as "reading notices"—that is, matter of one sort or another which is really an advertisement, and is paid for as such, but is so disguised as to make it seem, to the general public, an editorial utterance of the newspaper in which it appears. A large number of advertisers are constantly in quest of this sort of "notice" of their wares, and are willing to pay very highly for it; and the more complete the disguise is, either through the nature of the article, or its position in the paper, or its typographical arrangement, the more highly they are willing to pay. As a general rule the real character of these "reading notices" is perceptible at a glance in all newspaper offices, but they undoubtedly to a greater or less extent impose on the general public. In fact, if they did not do so, they would not be valued by the advertisers, and could only be sold at ordinary advertising rates. The one which the *Times* printed of the Bell Telephone Company was, to the professional eye, plainly enough an advertisement, but to the public it undoubtedly wore the appearance of an editorial examination of the history and prospects of the Bell Telephone Company, and it was because it wore this appearance that the company was willing to pay $1,200 for it. It was probably worth that money as an editorial view; as a mere advertisement it would have had no value whatever.

All this amounts to saying, we confess, that a "reading notice" is an attempt more or less successful to deceive the purchasing public. As such it is no worse than many things which are done in other reputable callings than journalism. But it has always seemed to us that newspapers were absolutely cut off from all these doubtful modes of making money by their position as preachers and censors. A minister who started a church, and let out the basement for a faro bank or drinking saloon, and inserted ingenious puffs of business enterprises of any kind in his sermons, might possibly be a sincere moralist, and an implacable hater of wrong-doing, but if his ways ever became known, he would find great difficulty in getting people to believe it. The journalistic business ought, in fact, to be on all its sides the most purely conducted of human callings, owing to its pulpit attachment. As a professional exposer of every species of hypocrisy and deception, a newspaper is bound to avoid the smallest sign of humbug in any of its dealings with the public.

Nobody who knows the *Times* really believes that its sale of a "reading notice" to the Bell Telephone Company in fact affected, or was meant to affect, its independence in dealing with that company, but there was certainly enough impropriety about it to make very puzzling its conduct in giving the public to understand, one month later, that there was to be shortly a great exposure of "a Bell Telephone scandal involving certain newspaper editors in New York," compared to which "the Pan-Electric scandal, involving certain public men in Washington, was a small matter," and "assuring the public that the corrupt and criminal league of an insolent corporation with venal newspapers would not avail." The object of this, if it had any object, was clearly to make people believe that the Bell Telephone had bought the support of certain New York newspapers, although there was nothing in the condition or prospects of the company, as set forth in the "reading notice," to make any such purchase seem necessary or probable. If it was for any reason desirable to say this, however, it was certainly most imprudent and unfortunate for the publisher of the "reading notice" to say it. A newspaper which publishes reading notices is not necessarily corrupt in the ordinary sense of that term, but it certainly takes up its abode in a glass house, and should abstain from every form of stone-throwing.

It is but just to the *Times* to say that it is by no means the greatest offender in this respect. Others do much worse things in that line than the *Times* has ever done. The worst thing a newspaper can do is to sell the columns usually reserved for what are called editorial articles, and speak through them on public questions for cash down. This among leading journals is, we believe, very rare indeed. But in the second-class venality which consists in selling columns for the gratification of private greed or malice, we have never known anything quite equal to the *Tribune's* sale of a whole page for a verbatim report of the torture of a poor man who had offended Mr. Loubat in his Union Club row, by a minute examination of his private affairs in supplementary proceedings. Moreover, the *Tribune* called attention to the disgraceful report in a brief editorial article. Any one who takes pay for this sort of thing does what, in any other intellectual calling, would cover him with indelible shame. That it can be done without shame in a newspaper, shows what the public opinion of journalism is.

THE TROUBLES IN GALICIA.

At the moment when Bismarck finds it needful for the strengthening of Germany to begin a Germanizing crusade in the Polish provinces of Prussia, and Russia, encouraged by the example, sharpens and extends her own measures of denationalization in the "Vistula Land," still graver trouble is reported to be brewing in Austria's share of ancient Poland, Galicia. The ignorant peasantry of that province are said to be driven to a pitch of frenzy by the fear of a massacre prepared for them by the nobles, in retaliation for the butcheries committed by peasant bands in 1846. Those butcheries form one of the saddest pages in the annals of Poland. A vast conspiracy for a general rising in all parts of the divided country had been organized, under the lead of the democratic portion of the Polish emigration, and the complete enfranchisement of the peasantry was the most salient feature of the revolutionary programme. The vigilance of Prussia and terroristic measures in Russia frustrated the attempts in Posen and the neighborhood of Warsaw. In the then existing semi-independent republic of Cracow the insurrection was successful for a short while. In Galicia the incipient rising was stifled in the blood of thousands of nobles—men and women—shed by brutalized victims of ancient feudal oppression. Metternich's official minions were accused of having secretly kindled and openly fomented the blind fury which put the murderous scythe, the flail, and the torch in the hands of the peasants.

If the reports which reach us are not grossly exaggerated, and another *Jacquerie* is not groundlessly apprehended by the Polish nobility of Galicia, whatever machinations may have so violently reinflamed the old class hatred so long after the enfranchisement of the peasantry by the semi-revolutionary legislation of 1848, have surely not emanated from the agency of Austrian official organs. The political aspect of affairs in that division of the Empire of the Hapsburgs is completely changed. Since the liberal reconstruction of that empire on the dual basis of 1867, the Poles of Galicia have been reckoned among the most faithful supporters of the Austrian throne, and, especially since the accession to power of the Taaffe Cabinet, under which the Slavic elements have obtained decided predominance in Cisleithania, have been

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

deemed the pet subjects of the Crown. The Czechs of Bohemia and Moravia, in their constantly increasing demands for national autonomy, threaten the basis of the permanent integrity of the empire, while the separatistic aspirations of Galicia, for reasons both geographical and historical, can be viewed with equanimity by the statesmen of Vienna. Should Galicia become detached from Cisleithan Austria, to form a part of a restored Poland, the new State would be the strongest outer bulwark of defence against Russia, with whom Austria-Hungary will have, sooner or later, to wrestle for existence. Even now, weak and exposed as the province is, it is considered a useful rampart, owing to the intense anti-Russian sentiment and martial valor of its Polish inhabitants.

Unfortunately, however, both for the cause of Poland and the dual empire ruled by the Hapsburgs, the Poles form only one-half of the Slavic population of Galicia. The other half, occupying the eastern portions of the province, consists of Ruthenes, a branch of the Slavic race holding a middle ground, nationally and denominationally, between Poles and Russians. The nearest of kin to the neighboring Little-Russians in the Empire of the Czar, they belong to that division of the Eastern Church which (under the name of Uniates, or United Greeks) acknowledges the religious supremacy of the Pope. The nobility of the country is almost completely Polish and Catholic; hence a double natural antagonism between Poles and Ruthenes. Dormant in former times, it has become active and dangerous in the last half-century. It was one of the means—in his system of dividing and ruling—which Metternich employed against Polish discontent. Since his fall and the transformation of Austria, Russia has found in it a convenient lever for counteracting the regeneration of the Polish nationality on her borders, under the auspices of the Hapsburgs. The strife between Ruthenes and Poles has, in late years, become envenomed. Panslavist plotters, Socialists, and Nihilists unceasingly incite the Ruthene peasantry against nobles, "Jesuits," and Jews. The ground is undermined. But the Austrian Government well knows the situation and the peril, and, should an outbreak occur, will undoubtedly act with prompt energy and unsparing rigor.

THE ACHARNIANS.

GREEK play has followed Greek play ever since the Oxford "Agamemnon" prompted the Harvard "Œdipus," and, not satisfied with Æschylus and Sophocles, enterprising Hellenists have proceeded to revive Aristophanes; and the English success of the "Birds" is to be followed by the American experiment of the "Acharnians," which is to be performed in Philadelphia on May 14 and 15. We have spoken of the English success of the "Birds," but, in default of actual vision, it may be permitted to doubt whether success of the highest kind is possible for such a play. According to the published accounts, nothing could have been more grotesque than the performance, and if hilarity is success, then the success was unquestionable. And yet a lover of Aristophanes may be excused for distrusting an attempt to fix the dissolving views of Cloud-cuckootown, to cage the trilling melodies of the "Birds," just as for the lover of Shakspere "Midsummer's Night's Dream" can only be acted in the chambers of the brain. But the "Acharnians" is far more substantial, far more of the earth earthy. The first scene of the "Birds" introduces us to a region which is as unreal and mystical as the opening of the "Inferno." In the "Acharnians" we are at once on familiar ground, and instead of two mysterious beings on their way to Birddom, we encounter a flesh-and-blood Attic countryman who has taken up his abode in Athens in order to avoid the incursions of the Doric army. Instead of the flapping, fluttering, piping, quavering bird-chorus we have a tramping, pounding, banging chorus of Acharnians, hard-fisted charcoal-burners, who understand no poetic nonsense and utter none. There is comparatively little variety in the choral rhythms of the "Acharnians," and any moderately well-trained ear can catch the ever-recurring Cretic stamp, whereas the music of the "Birds" runs through almost the whole repertory of antique rhythms, and tries the most tripping modern utterance.

Not every one, however familiar he may be with Greek, can fly with the "Birds." Every one, no matter how prosaic his gait, can keep step with the "Acharnians." The movement of the piece, too, is simple but effective—so effective that if our civil war had left us much heart for joking while it was going on, we, too, might have had our "Acharnians," in which some Federal or Confederate borderer might have made a separate peace with the enemy and have regaled himself with tobacco or coffee, while his languishing countrymen had to put up with cabbage leaves or rye. Indeed, much of the fun of the "Acharnians" is on the surface, much of it lies in the situation; and to those who do not know the original well enough to take the finer points, an outline of the plot—if plot it may be called—will leave merriment enough to make the comedy amusing. Comedy—not farce, as some have been inclined to call it, for the art of the "Acharnians" is not to be depressed beneath its proper rank. It is intensely literary, and of itself suffices to explode any attempt to distribute the comedies of Aristophanes into literary and political, for it is both; and though the plot is hardly sufficiently well articulated to deserve the name, still it is not a mere succession of loose scenes strung on the thread of a common theme. The play does not split in half as the "Frogs" does, or seems to do. There is a regular progress from trial to triumph; the simple *motif* of contrast between peace and war is relieved by an admirable variety of figures, now representative men from abroad, now applications from home, while two figures, the hero of arms, Lamachus, and the apostle of peace, Dicæopolis, brace the play from opposing sides. The ludicrous scene of the returning ambassadors and the foreign envoys is not otiose. It gives justification of the secessionist proceeding of Dicæopolis. And the only part of the piece that seems to disturb the organism is the exquisite fooling of the appeal to Euripides, when Dicæopolis, about to plead for his life before the embittered Acharnians, applies to the poet for a tragic outfit in which to move his angry judges to pity. Yet this scene grows so naturally out of the situation, makes the plea of Dicæopolis so irresistibly comic, and retards the action so aptly, that it is a beauty and not a blemish even from the point of view of the plot.

But we have been betrayed into writing of the "Acharnians" as if the plot were as familiar to the English reader as that of any of the Sullivan-Gilbert extravaganzas; and surely it is the English reader's own fault if it is not, for the "Acharnians" has been fortunate in its translators from Frere to Tyrrell. Perhaps, in view of the approaching performance, both those who know the piece and those who do not may find a summary timely.

Dicæopolis is discovered in solitary meditation. The scene, the Pnyx. He is brooding over the troubles of this life, and comes to a conclusion, reached long before him by certain of his own prophets, that life has more pains than pleasures—and his life in particular—four grains of pleasure to a Sahara of annoyances. It was a joy to see Cleon disgorge, but what an anguish to set one's mouth for Æschylus and get Theognis. It was a delight to hear one musician perform, worse than pressing to death to be tortured by another. But the worst of all is to stay here and wait for the assembling of the people, and see the hustling of the belated crowds, and after all to hear no word for peace. Dicæopolis is always the first on the ground, sighing, yawning, stretching, making notes, going over his accounts, finishing his toilet, and oh! gazing out toward his farm, yearning for peace, longing for his own dear village, that never cried, like hateful Athens, "Buy coals," "Buy vinegar," "Buy oil"—"Sweet Buy and Buy," in sooth. By this time Dicæopolis is wrought up to the pitch of howling down every speaker who does not plead for peace, and so poses at once in the character which he is to maintain throughout.

It is midday. The crowd comes thronging into their seats. The herald calls for speakers, and one Amphitheus rises and proclaims his divine lineage in true Euripidean fashion, and declares that he is empowered by the gods to make peace with Sparta; but, like so many modern men with a mission, he has to confess that the funds are not forthcoming, and he is unceremoniously led out by the police, while Dicæopolis, who pleads his cause, is ordered to be silent. Remonstrance is in vain, for just then the embassy that has been at the court of the Shah is announced, and the chief of the mission gives a report of the arduous services of himself and his colleagues, all for the beggarly pay of two drachmæ a day. Of course each particular is duly commented on by Dicæopolis—the misery of being conveyed in a cushioned carriage, the woe of drinking sweet wine without a drop of water out of goblets of crystal and gold, the anguish of keeping up the reputation of the Athenians among the barbarians by heavy eating and hard drinking, the long waiting on the Shah's movements, the desperate struggle with oxen piping hot from the oven and the mammoth mockbird with which the Shah entertained them. But now their troubles are over, and they have brought with them the Eye of the Shah, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the Lord of the Golden Plane-tree, Sham-Ibrahim by name. Sham-Ibrahim's gibberish is confidently translated to mean that the Shah promises to send gold; but when the Eye is requested to emphasize the word gold, the envoy announces in sufficiently intelligible Greek that gold they are to have none.

But Dicæopolis is the only one whose ear is purged to understand the purport of the answer, and his protest goes for naught. The Eye is taken off solemnly to a state banquet, and the only comfort Dicæopolis finds is the reappearance of Amphitheus, whom he intrusts with a commission to buy him a special peace for himself, his children, and his good woman. In the sweet assurance that his own future is secure, Dicæopolis listens with greater coolness at first to the lying representations of another embassy, this time from Thrace, who bring with them a ragged regiment of foreign ruffians; but after a while indignation gets the better of him, and he protests again. At this point the assembly is dissolved and Dicæopolis is left alone, but not long, for Amphitheus rushes on the stage in hot haste, closely pursued by the Acharnians, whose fair vineyards had been ruthlessly laid waste by

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Peloponnesians, and who breathe nothing but revenge against the enemy and against all compromisers—original Union men or Copperheads. Amphitheus has only time to show three samples of the wine of peace—the quinquennial, the decennial, and the thirty years' vintage; and as soon as Dicæopolis decides that the thirty years' peace is the best, that it smells of ambrosia and nectar, that it says, "No three-days' cooked rations" as distinctly as anything, and "Go where thou wilt," "Ha! that is the peace for him and a fig for the Acharnians"—as soon as Dicæopolis, then, gives his hearty and unqualified and ingurgitating approval of the long term, the mediator vanishes and the Acharnians come tramping in.

We have no space for the discussion of the way in which the twenty-four stalwart Acharnians deliver what is set down for them; but whether singly or together, they make the air resonant with their clamor. Amphitheus has escaped. The charcoal-burners are not in their first youth, and the nimble runner who sped from Athens to Sparta and back, in utter defiance of the unities, has been too quick for them. But, thank heaven, they are not too old for throwing stones, of which they make ample provision. Just then Dicæopolis enters, prepared to offer sacrifice to Dionysus; his wife, daughter, and slaves in his train. The chorus, hearing his call for religious silence, secrete themselves, while Dicæopolis offers his prayer to Dionysus, marshals his little procession, and sings a hymn to one of the boon companions of Bacchus—a notable sample of a Phallic song. Scarcely has he uttered the words, "The shield shall in the smokehouse hang aloft," when the Acharnians, who have a professional interest in all that pertains to smoke, rush forth with the cry: "Here's the villain, here's the villain. Pelt him, pelt him, pelt him, pelt him! Hit him, hit the renegado; pelt away, pelt away!" Dicæopolis receives them with dignity, and, in response to their hasty, choking objurgation, answers as a hero of Euripides might have answered in like stress. The chorus are resolved that he must die, but quiet down enough to engage in a debate with the culprit, in which each party hurls tetrameters at the other until the discussion is cut short by the announcement of the chorus that they will hear him no further: the traitor who has made peace with the enemy is doomed.

But Dicæopolis has been watching his opportunity, and as they are about to execute sentence, produces a hostage that he has seized—none other than Coal Creel—and threatens to slaughter the dear Being on the spot. This brings the Acharnians to terms at once, in their fear for their beloved basket. They throw down the stones that they had gathered, Dicæopolis the sword that he had drawn; and the accused offers to vindicate his cause with his head on the block. But before Dicæopolis begins his speech he desires one favor. He is in festal array, and the proper thing for the defendant in such a case is to equip himself with mean attire in order to move the jury to compassion. "Might he not ask permission to get himself up in regulation costume?" The chorus is cynically sceptical about the efficacy of any toggery he might select, even if it were the cloak of darkness; but Dicæopolis takes his fate in his hands, and goes to Euripides—who lives conveniently near—the "beggar-poet," the "rag-picker." The interview with Euripides lasts a long time. It is the first of the many showers that the Zeus of comedy discharges at the great poet. Of Socrates, Aristophanes soon wearies; of Euripides, never. Here, apart from the parodies, the main point is the lowering of the dignity of the tragic stage by the introduction of heroes in extreme destitution, the Euripidean realism from which Sophocles did not disdain to learn. And so Dicæopolis borrows of Euripides article after article of his tragic "property." The rags and tatters of Euripides' different heroes are carefully inspected, and the wardrobe of hero after hero is rejected as too good, until the scarecrow suit of Euripides' chiefest tatterdemalion, Telephus, is discovered lying between the mammocked apparel of Thyestes and the draggle-tail costume of Ino. Next he claims a Mysian cap, and, thus equipped, begins to feel the afflatus of Euripidean phrases; but he needs still more, and secures, one after another, a beggar's staff, a basket with a hole burnt in it, a noggin with its lip knocked off, a damaged pipkin with a sponge for a plug. By this time Euripides declares that Dicæopolis has carried off his entire tragedy, and when the importunate beggar asks for a few greens to put in his basket, the allusion to his mother's calling as an herb-seller is too much for the poet's patience, and the servant is bidden, in tragic tones, "Lower the portcullis," or, if you choose, "Close the fortalice."

In the defence which Dicæopolis now makes, the orator begins his *captatio benevolentiæ* by professing his hatred of the Lacedæmonians, and yet finds that they are not wholly to blame for the hostilities. It is the rascally politicians that are the cause of the trouble. Some little extradition difficulties between Megara and Athens, in which Aspasia had a special interest, roused the wrath of Pericles, the Olympian who "lightened and thundered and churned Greece to storm." The Megarians appealed to Sparta. Sparta begged the Athenians to modify their exclusion of Megara. They flatly refused. Hence the war. Now, suppose the boot had been on the other leg; what then? Would not the Athenians have mobilized their fleet as vigorously as the Spartans their army? The fact is, in the words of the prophet, "Athens doth not know; my people doth not consider."

The application of this familiar text divides the chorus into two parties, and in the midst of the altercation Lamachus appears, the very Hotspur to whose memory Aristophanes is to do honor in after years. His coming had been invoked by the war party, and Lamachus and Dicæopolis engage in a duel of words in which all the fine language is on the side of Lamachus, the fun on the side of Dicæopolis, who laughs at his military rig, sneers at his heroism at so much per diem, rakes up the army record of the general with one hand and his debts with the other. Exeunt Lamachus and Dicæopolis—Lamachus with proclamation of vigorous war by sea and by land; Dicæopolis with announcement of open market to all the Peloponnesians, to Megarians west and Bœotians north.

The chorus is now and henceforth entirely on the side of Dicæopolis, and in the first line of the *parabasis*, which now follows, announces that he has won his case. The *parabasis*, that part of the ancient comedy in which the poet takes the public into his confidence—that part on which the highest art and the most telling eloquence are expended—withdraws itself from the appreciation of those who are interested in the comic situation only. Without the rhythm, without the music, without the politics, the *parabasis* seems an impertinent interlude; and yet this opening of the window in the heart of Momus enables us to see the piece in its true light. In the *parabasis* of the "Acharnians," Aristophanes vindicates his political course, and glorifies his services to the state as a wise and prudent counsellor—one whom the tributaries are eager to see, one whom the Shah honors, whom the enemy is eager to appropriate. No wonder the Lacedæmonians demand Ægina from the Athenians, for with Ægina goes Aristophanes. But the poet is not to be given up; he must continue to administer wise advice to the state, and Cleon may rage and imagine vain things to the end. And to show how worthy he is of their esteem, he reads them a lecture on the shameful manner in which young speakers bully the old men in the assembly of the people.

The *parabasis* over (it is to be feared the uninitiated would call some of it "gag"), we are ready for the merriment of the feast day. The free market proclaimed by Dicæopolis is open to every one except Lamachus, informers, and like cattle; and the hero, after surveying the ground, goes off to bring the pillar on which the terms are recorded. Meantime a Megarian and his two daughters appear and talk in dialect, to the great delight of scholars. The Megarians were of a coarse and hard type, and, being borderers, were thoroughly detested by the Athenians, who raided their poverty-stricken canton with unfailing regularity at the due season of the year. The Megarian has nothing to sell, and concerts with his daughters a Megaric trick: rigs them out in pettitoes and pigs' snouts and put them into a bag, intending to sell them as swine to Dicæopolis, who returns just as the arrangements are completed. Of course the Megaric trick does not impose on Dicæopolis, and the whole scene that ensues is a series of coarse but clever double meanings. The Megarian is made happy by a bundle of garlic for one pig and a measure of salt for the other, and aftertimes are made richer by two familiar phrases, though coarse men who refuse "to buy a pig in a poke," and old women who talk about girls as "having taken their pigs to a bad market," little suspect the origin and the force of the words they are using, and it is well.

The Megarian has not left the stage, and is in the act of wishing that he could dispose of his entire family on as good terms, when an informer appears and tries to confiscate the bag, but he is speedily taken in charge by three strapping fellows who constitute the market police, and Dicæopolis and the Megarian part the best of friends. This auspicious opening of business is celebrated by a song from the chorus glorifying the hero of peace and predicting his triumph over all his enemies.

The news has spread, and a Bœotian comes in, he and his man heavily laden with the products of his rich canton. Athens had little to offer for the hamper of game, for the glorious eel, queen of the nymphs of Copais. Sardines and pottery, the main things that Attica has to offer, are cheap enough in Bœotia, but one thing the Bœotians lack—they have no informers, no "sycophants"; and the prince of sycophants, coming in at the instant, is allowed to develop his capacities for formulating charges of high treason, and then, having shown himself to be the genuine article, is packed up and delivered to the Bœotians as a vessel of honor, a peachblow vase. Lamachus, who had been formally excluded from the market, now sends a servant to buy a drachma worth of thrushes and three drachmæ worth of eel; but Dicæopolis is inflexible, and enters his house with a halo of feathered game about his head.

Another song, in which the wisdom of Dicæopolis, the horror of war, the charms of those twin spirits of peace, Aphrodite and Eros, are vividly set forth, and Dicæopolis returns for the final manifestation of his genius. A herald proclaims the Feast of the Flagons, and preparations are made for a great banquet. Dicæopolis, as a true artist to whom nothing culinary is alien, watches over the rites of the open-air kitchen with loving care. Throughout the scene his tones and his actions are sober to suit the grave matters of roasting and basting which are going forward. The occupation is too absorbing for more than snatches of talk with the applicants for help, who come

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this time from home. A peasant who has lost a yoke of oxen is dismissed without a drop of the precious elixir of peace; the best man of a bridegroom, who brings a portion from the wedding feast and sues for a gill of peace for his friend, has the present rejected and himself sent empty away; but Dicæopolis has not the heart to refuse a similar petition made by a bridesmaid on behalf of the bride, and sends her a prophylactic against the conscription of her husband.

No sooner has the bridesmaid disappeared than a herald enters and summons Lamachus to the field, and every verse that Lamachus utters while making his preparations for the march is echoed by a joyous parody from Dicæopolis, who is making his preparations for the banquet. This *stichomythia* over, the chorus sings a mocking song to the dispraise of one of the poet's rivals, and the piece closes with another contrasted tableau of Lamachus and Dicæopolis; for Lamachus returns grievously hurt by an inglorious stake, and his moans and groans meet with merry response from Dicæopolis, who, having won the prize of a wineskin as the most redoubtable drinker, lustily chants in his own honor the Greek "See, the conquering hero comes." And all the chorus replies, "See, the conquering hero comes."

By this rough sketch of the play, what was said in the beginning is sufficiently proved. The balance is too mechanical, and the situations are broad, but the literary workmanship redeems the breadth—and the breeziness of the piece, its perpetual bustle, bring it nearer to the un-Greek public than most of the possible plays of Aristophanes. To be sure, if the object of the performance be to bring the Greeks nearer to us as Greeks and not as men, much might be said for some other selection; but, as the true reproduction of the antique must be left to the brain of the student and not to the eyes of the spectator, we must be content if any work of antiquity can be lifted out of the mummy-case and be made to live and move again, so that the Greeks may appear, if not wholly Greek, yet as something more than the dead stock-in-trade of grammarians and antiquarians.

MR. GLADSTONE'S OFFER TO IRELAND.

DUBLIN, April 19, 1886.

THERE is something almost bewildering in the events of the past ten days—especially to those who all their lives have hoped for some form of autonomy for Ireland, and to whom age, while it did not weaken their desires, was bringing that numbed hopelessness which comes, as life advances, to most people engaged in struggles against heavy odds. The end cannot be said to have come yet. It is, however, impossible to believe that what has been said can ever be entirely gone back upon. The utterances of Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Morley, Sir William Harcourt, and other leading British statesmen accept and embody the arguments in favor of Irish self-government urged from the times of Grattan and the volunteers to the present, and, even if now overborne, would remain an armory which would furnish materials to us for an indefinite prolongation of the struggle. And the mind naturally dwells upon the central figures in the drama. We do not know whether to wonder more at Mr. Gladstone or Mr. Parnell: at the aged British statesman (with "his intellect like the arch of heaven," as was remarked by one of his bitterest Irish opponents in the darkest coercion days) showing such a capacity for recognizing the necessities of the occasion, and bending himself to them, in apparent inconsistency with all his previous utterances and the traditions of his order; or at the young Irishman, who, commencing with nothing but himself and a policy, has in a few years raised Ireland from a condition of the most hopeless prostration to one of highest hope and greatest confidence in her own powers. "Will no one stop that madman Grattan?" was Burke's exclamation some hundred years ago; "Will no one wring the neck of that nuisance Parnell?" was the general attitude of polite society towards the Irish leader until within a comparatively short period.

None but those intimately acquainted with Irish affairs can realize what Mr. Parnell has effected, or how he is regarded by the Irish people. Eight years ago matters were at their lowest. Some of those now passed away, and who have given their names to Irish history as strenuous patriots, privately acknowledged that there would be "no home rule," and that the only hope for Ireland lay in subsidiary reforms. Others retired from the struggle, retaining their own opinions, but believing that the old hopes had, so far as effective agitation went, died out in the hearts of the Irish people. It was in the face of this feeling that Mr. Parnell, more correctly gauging the situation, took the matter in hand. "You are a dangerous man to speak to: I come to you to know the worst," he urged in effect to a despondent friend who had been engaged in the struggle long before his own attention had been turned to it; "but I mean to try what I can do." Measuring human action by the standard of the Sermon on the Mount, it is impossible to justify many things that have been said and done in this, as in all other, national uprisings—all the methods by which this wonderful revolution has been effected in British thought. Again and again, within the past eight years, have some of those who believed they best-loved Ireland had to hide their faces in anguish at what has been said or done or implied or left unsaid. The best that can be said is this—that it was better than war or civil war; and there are few now who do not acknowledge that had the mass of the Irish people had the power and the chance of success, they would long ago have been justified in resorting to armed force to cut the meshes of the system in which they were enveloped. There is nothing, in the opinion of the present writer, inconsistent in Mr. Gladstone's and the Earl of Spencer's change of front on the Irish question—one moment plunging into tentative reforms and attempting to govern Ireland through a stern coercive policy; again adopting the measures to which they have now given their names. Having, with the best intentions, as we Irish are now generally prepared to admit, with all the forces of the British empire at their back, made full trial of the one policy, and found it ineffective, they have had the manliness to acknowledge their mistake and enter upon another course. And in doing this they are giving one other most striking exhibition of that power of accommodating themselves to facts and altered circumstances which has enabled the governing classes of Great Britain to maintain their position.

Still, no matter what the power and the genius and the influence of Mr. Gladstone and his home-rule Cabinet, we can but dimly estimate the conviction and the prejudice that will yet be aroused and marshalled against the measure. There are stormy times before us, however much we may believe that a large measure of local self-government is certain to be the outcome. The scheme propounded by Mr. Gladstone, in its main features, appears to meet the approval of Mr. Parnell and his colleagues. Nothing was more striking in this regard than Mr. O'Brien's "Every man of us," in reply to the taunt of an English member that even the Irish party had not accepted it; and Mr. Parnell in the House, and *United Ireland*, the accredited organ of the party, exhibit the same spirit. Having said so much, I must now express the opinion, in which most Protestant Nationalists with whom I have spoken are in accord, that the measure, as it stands, has in it none of the elements of finality. It is impossible to believe that the non-representation of Ireland in imperial affairs could be permanently satisfactory. The bill, if passed unaltered, would place us in a position beneath that of the great colonies, and even that of the Channel Islands: we should be very much in the position of the Isle of Man. We should have no influence over the Crown, which could interpose its veto on any one of our acts; we should have no control over the army and navy which garrisoned our forts and swept our bays. We should be shut out from the family of nations. Abroad, we should be represented only by courtesy. As often as we returned home, the gleam of an Irish lighthouse would come as a token of our subjection, for even it would be under the control of a Power foreign to ourselves. Complete separation would be a definite and comprehensible policy. It is not the policy of the party to which the writer of these communications belongs. Our ideal has been a settlement on the basis of your Union, or the North German Confederation. There would be something definite and honorable in such a settlement, but not in this. Perhaps we would accept it, as better than the present status, but we could not accept it with any belief in its finality. To suppose that a nation of five millions would permanently settle down in such a subsidiary position would appear to us an impossibility. We have no desire to interfere in English or Scotch local affairs, but we claim, with the English and Scotch, equal rights in the settlement of matters of common interest; and, while few of us can regard with equanimity the means by which the empire has been got together, we feel that it would not be good for us, nor should we have any right, now to wash our hands of responsibility in the government and the future of that empire.

It is ominous for the hopes of speedy settlement that the Irish leaders do not appear to participate in these feelings. Public and private utterances lead to the opinion forcibly expressed in *United Ireland* of the 17th inst.:

"The most surprising feature of English [the editor puts out of view Irish] criticism of the Home Rule Bill, is the repugnance to the exclusion of the Irish members from the Westminster Parliament. . . . This we regard as an unmitigated misfortune for the two countries. If the home-rule experiment is to succeed, it can only be by having all the attention of the Irish people fixed upon home legislation, and all the energies of the Irish representatives concentrated in Ireland. A representation at Westminster would mean the continued drain of the best parliamentary intellect of the country, which, for years to come, would find superabundant employment at home. The disaster, however, would be less to the dignity and efficiency of the Irish Parliament than it would be to the good relations between the countries. . . . All questions between the two countries would remain open and sore. . . . The object and desire of the Irish leaders, no less than of the English, is to make an honest end of the international quarrel," etc.

We cannot think so poorly of the depth of Irish administrative capacity as to believe it would not furnish sufficient for due attention to imperial as well as full attention to home matters. It is impossible to believe that the good relations between the countries would not be subject to more strain under such an arrangement than under one in which we had a voice in the regulations which would press upon us in our relations to the central Government. I have heard it suggested that contentment with the proposed arrangement probably arises from the small extent to which Catholics can feel real interest in the affairs of a Protestant empire. But Mr. Parnell is not a Catholic, nor is he a man who naturally looks at things from a Catholic point of view,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And one would think a Catholic nation like Ireland would be slow to sacrifice any influence it possesses in the empire on the side of its co-religionists, under the same flag and in foreign countries where British influence and diplomacy are not without their weight. The one factor which makes us slow to condemn the present proposal is the acceptance it has met with from Mr. Parnell. He has all through shown perspicacity and foresight. Upon the success or failure of the proposed experiment will rest his claim to rank among the first of statesmen or the greatest of disturbers in history. He cannot be unmindful of such considerations; yet, even with this in view, and without entirely holding in abeyance our reason, a definite party in Ireland cannot share the feelings of those to whom we should desire unhesitatingly to trust a settlement. So long as the difficulty of separating local and imperial interests in Parliament was urged by British statesmen as a reason against home rule, we perhaps accorded it too little weight. Now that it is urged by statesmen who are willing to grant us a form of home rule, we may well feel its reality. Nevertheless, considerable delay and the most thorough discussion of the question are desirable, in the hope that some better settlement may be evolved than that proposed—some settlement which, if necessitating a more entire reconstruction of the fabric of the British legislative system, will at least prove to be permanent and satisfactory without being humiliating to either nation. D. B.

THE PRINCES OF CONDÉ.—II.

PARIS, April 20, 1886.

WE have said that the father of the "Grand Condé" sent his son, during his early years, to the castle of Montrond, in Berry. The young Prince took in 1626 the name of Duke of Anguien (the name was thus spelt in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; it was spelt afterwards Enghien; the Duc d'Aumale has returned to the old style). He made his first entry into Bourges, where his father was governor, at the age of five, on the occasion of his baptism, and he was able to say the *Credo* himself in Latin. He returned immediately to Montrond, and received the first lessons of military art from an engineer named Sarrazin, who was reconstructing the walls of the fortress. His father, returning one day from Languedoc, was surprised to find a young captain, seven years old, who was drilling and commanding the boys of the place, and conducting them against an imaginary foe. The real education of the Prince began when his father placed him in the Jesuits' college at Bourges. The colleges of this order were very flourishing at that time. Their system, their *ratio studiorum*, fixed by Father-General Acquaviva, had transformed the education of youth. In vain had the universities and the local *parlements* tried to stop their progress. The movement was irresistible. In 1627 the Company had in its twelve colleges of the province of Paris no less than 13,180 pupils. Condé had long been the hope of the Protestants, but after he reconciled himself with the court he had become their ardent enemy: he showed himself very unmerciful in his war against the Huguenots in the south of France. He was in constant fear of Richelieu, and when he confided his son to the Jesuits, he did a thing which he knew would be agreeable to the Cardinal. He seems to have been sincere in his great devotion to the Jesuits, whom he constantly employed in all his affairs, and whom he protected everywhere.

Condé was fortunate in the choice of the preceptor, Father Pelletier, who was adroit, assiduous, vigilant, with much sense and knowledge. He gave as governor to his son a gentleman, M. La Buffetière, who had for his special mission all that concerned physical exercise; and a doctor, M. de Montreuil. For six years Louis of Bourbon went every day to the Collège Sainte-Marie, living in an old hôtel which was not far distant. In the classroom he was separated from the other pupils by a gilded balustrade; but this was the only distinction maintained, and his father particularly insisted on his going through all the compositions and examinations. He himself saw the notes of the child, his *devoirs*, and he wrote regularly to him. His notes, his instructions on the subject of the education of his son, were incessant.

There is, at the present moment, an active movement against classical studies. I need hardly say that it cannot be serious. The Latin language especially is the fountain of a French education. Young Condé was made familiar with it: he read the Latin authors, especially the historians, Florus, Livy, Tacitus, Cæsar. The Jesuits have always shown much predilection for the poets, and Virgil, Horace, Ovid, were certainly placed in his hands. "One of the manuscripts," says the Duc d'Aumale, "preserved at Chantilly contains a collection of Latin poems in the most varied rhythms, offered and dedicated to the Prince of Condé by Louis de Bourbon, in his early years: 'ætatulam meam, quæso, intuere, quæ, ut tenera est ac primi vixdum tirocinii capax, etc. . . .'" The young Prince wrote regularly to his father in Latin; he entered the class in rhetoric at twelve; at thirteen he spoke Latin as fluently as French. He devoted the two following years to philosophy and to the sciences. At the end of each term he defended publicly a series of propositions in the form of theses, which were printed and dedicated, some to the King, some to Cardinal Richelieu. They were distributed, by the care of his father, to the ministers, to the principal members of the *Parlement*, to the Bishops, in Paris, in the provinces, and even in Rome. Then came a course of law, which was quite a novelty, but Monsieur le Prince was constantly engaged in lawsuits, and judged that some technical knowledge would not be unnecessary to his son. The professor chosen by him was a M. Mérille, who occupied at Bourges the chair of Cujas, and had a great reputation. This M. Mérille was not devoid of vanity, and called himself *doctorum princeps et doctor principis*. The Institutes of Justinian were explained to the young Prince, who himself wrote a treatise on entails.

The vacations were spent at Montrond, and were given to equitation and hunting. At the age of fifteen the young Prince was presented to the King at Paris. He went to Saint-Maur to make a visit to his mother, whom he had not often had occasion to see, and made a journey to Burgundy, where he remained while his father conducted a campaign in Franche-Comté. In 1637 he entered the "Royal Academy for Young Noblemen" in Paris, a military school which had been opened recently, and which Louis XIII. had taken under his protection. The young men who were destined to the profession of arms learned there geography, mathematics, geometry, the art of fortification, fencing, and equitation, and were militarily drilled. The Prince was very apprehensive of the influence which the Princess might have on her son: he feared the frivolity and the pleasures of her salon. The Princess was the queen of the "précieuses." Young Condé was allowed, however, at times to see her and her little court, Mlle. de Scudéry, Mme. de Sablé, the Marchioness of Rambouillet, Voiture, Balzac, Chapelain. He became acquainted with the young friends of his sister, with the most intimate of all, Julie d'Angennes, with the young Montmorency, with the charming Marthe du Vigean, with whom he afterwards fell in love, with the daughters of the Duke of Mantua, Marie and Anne de Gonzague.

After one year spent at the military academy, the education of Condé was thought complete. In speaking of this education, the Duc d'Aumale says: "The Prince acted wisely in living habitually away from his son. At a distance, his good sense, his perseverance, his firmness, were alone felt; a continual cohabitation would have rendered his tyranny insupportable. The moral direction was not absent; but while he imposed respect on his son, Henri de Bourbon neglected to develop delicate sentiments in this young soul, to touch certain chords which never vibrated in the great heart of Condé." At this moment, the Duc d'Anguien was chosen by the King for the government of Burgundy during the absence of his father, who had received the command of the army of Guienne. He sat for the first time in this quality in the *Parlement* of Dijon in March, 1638. His father had prudently placed near him trusty advisers. While he was at Dijon, he made the acquaintance of some generals, and, among others, of Marchin, who was born at Liége, and who had learned the art of war under the best masters. He neglected no opportunity for study. He worked every day at mathematics; he himself made plans of the eleven fortified towns of Burgundy, accompanying each plan with notes and legends. He followed habitually the exercises of the troops. No regiment crossed Burgundy without being reviewed by him. He had his own troops, bearing his name of Condé, as was then the privilege and the duty of the Princes of the royal blood. He gave equal attention to the general affairs of the province, and liked to meet the members of the legal profession.

Bossuet's great "oraison funèbre" has contributed to spread the idea that everything in Condé's career was owing to genius, and not much to work. Bossuet did not enter into details; he shows us the conqueror of Rocroy without speaking of his antecedents: the young hero, in his admirable oration, jumps, as it were, *in medias res*. The Duc d'Aumale has almost astonished us by showing what a care education had been in the formation and development of this young hero. The minute particulars which he gives on this point have been found of great interest. It is probable that if the education of young Bonaparte at Brienne and after Brienne could be analyzed with as much care, it would be found that here, also, nature was powerfully helped by art and by education. It is also curious to see to what extent paternal authority was maintained in the seventeenth century. Here we have a Prince of the blood already governor of a large province, trusted with the most important functions and duties, while in his private life he is far from emancipated. His father not only gave him a council for political affairs, he maintained the powers of La Buffetière, he gave him a Jesuit confessor, Father Mugnier, who read with him and "saw to his deportment." The Jesuit regulates the expenses of the young Prince, he orders his clothes at times, he prevents him from hunting.

The Duc d'Anguien received the King at Dijon in September, 1639, accompanied him to the frontier of his Government, and showed him all the plans of his fortresses. Louis XIII. and the ministers were favorably impressed by the young Governor. Richelieu writes to his father: "I will begin this letter with the good qualities of M. le Duc d'Anguien, which are such that you must be pleased with them. He has much intelligence, discretion, and judgment. He has grown by two fingers and will grow more, as far as can be judged. His respect for you shows itself in all his actions. I think that it will be prudent to choose for him this winter a veteran

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

much experienced in the art of war; and as for the next campaign, I believe that you will not let it pass without his seeing it with the oldest marshal of France, so that he may be instructed as behooves a Prince of his quality."

Henri II. of Condé, who had never known his own father, had very absolute notions on the subject of paternal authority. He had determined to marry his son, and to marry him in the family of Richelieu; no consideration could modify his decision. He chose Mlle. de Maillé-Brézé, who was the niece of Richelieu. She was poor, and her rank did not seem to mark her for such an alliance; but the protection of Richelieu was attached to it. In 1640 the Duc d'Anguien was presented to Mlle. de Maillé and engaged to her (she was then only twelve years old). He left her almost immediately and made his first campaign as volunteer in the north of France, under the Marshal de la Meilleraie. He witnessed the siege of Arras, and showed much application; he was every day among the troops and in the trenches. He also took part in the sieges of several other places. When he returned to Paris, between two sieges, he felt that he had now two masters instead of one, Richelieu as well as his father. He bore this new tyranny in the hope of receiving soon from the Cardinal the command of a great army. His father hardly allowed him to see the Princess, being jealous of her influence and of the influence of the young men called the "petits-maîtres," who formed the brilliant court of the Princess and of Mme. de Rambouillet. Richelieu saw the danger among the handsome friends of young Condé's sister, Isabelle de Montmorency, Marthe du Vigean.

The Duc d'Anguien was summoned to Richelieu in April, 1642. The Cardinal was at Narbonne, defending his life and his power against Cinq-Mars, and struggling against an incurable malady. The young Duke remained some time with the Cardinal, and was faithful to him in the great drama which ended in the arrest of the young favorite, but he felt sometimes himself a desire to revolt: "The Cardinal is a tyrant; he has exasperated the Queen, the Queen Mother, Monsieur, the Count of Soissons, and many others." The Cardinal forced him to treat the Princes of the Church in a way he did not like. At a moment when his pride was deeply wounded, when he had become almost rebellious in his heart, he learned that the Cardinal was dead. He ran at once to Paris. His father had lost no time, he had seen Mazarin; a great command was assured to the Duc d'Anguien. Louis XIII. respected the choices made by the dying Cardinal for a new campaign, and Condé received his commission for the command of the army of Picardy.

Correspondence.

DR. BALL'S 'STORY OF THE HEAVENS.'

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Will you kindly afford me the opportunity of making some remarks relatively to a review of my book, the 'Story of the Heavens,' which recently appeared in your paper? Your reviewer thinks that I have unduly appropriated two passages from Prof. Newcomb's 'Popular Astronomy,' and as the extracts he has given justify the charge, it seems incumbent on me to explain.

I first refer to the longer of the two passages, of which the subject has a somewhat curious connection. In 1877 I published a book on 'Elementary Astronomy,' of which an American edition appeared shortly afterward, edited by Prof. Newcomb. One of the two changes he made was the substitution of Sirius and his companion for a double star which I had used, and some letters passed between us in which I expressed my approval of the change. About the same time the 'Popular Astronomy' appeared. It is evident that I transcribed from it the passage relating to the subject of our correspondence, and, after the lapse of six or seven years, I carelessly seem to have regarded the language as my own. Had I been asked before I read your review where I first obtained the Sirius anecdote, I could not have readily replied. It was, of course, long familiar to me when in 1884 I paid a delightful visit to the Alvan Clarks at Cambridgeport, and heard it once again from the discoverers themselves.

The short passage about Tycho Brahe I extracted from the 'Popular Astronomy' a few years ago. Of course, I ought to have preserved the inverted commas, but by some mistake I did not, and consequently overlooked its source.

And now, having admitted my errors, I think I am entitled to complain at the prominence you have given them. Is it fair that more than half the review should be devoted to strictures upon less than one-five-hundredth part of my work? Such a mode of criticism is not likely to convey a just impression. 'The Story of the Heavens' is at least an honest book. It is the result of years of thought and of study, of years of experience as a professor and a lecturer, and of years of practical work in the observatory.—I remain, yours truly,

Robert S. Ball.

Observatory, Co. Dublin, April 16, 1886.

[We will not be more implacable than Profs. Newcomb and Young, who in the last number of *Science* (April 30) freely exonerate Dr. Ball. —Ed. Nation.]

HARVARD FACSIMILES: A SUGGESTION.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: For reasons which will appear in the course of this communication, I do not think there can be a better time than the present to put forth a suggestion which I have long been intending to make, and I will give it all the prominence I can by confining my letter to this one point.

It is most desirable that facsimiles, in the best style, should be executed of the Harvard documents at Cambridge, and of the most important of the Harvard entries in the Parish Register of St. Saviour's, Southwark, permission for which, I feel sure, would be readily granted. Not only the exact color of the ink, but the very texture of the paper of the original, can now be made to appear, as you will see in the facsimile of a letter of Sir Philip Sidney, which I have asked may be sent to you. I would reproduce the entire page of the signatures of the Emmanuel B.A.s in 1631 and the M.A.s in 1635, and the full page of the *Recepta* in which John Harvard is mentioned; and to these there should be added so much of a contemporary map or semi-pictorial representation of the city as will show the site of the Harvard House in the High Street of Southwark. The whole would be comprised in the moderate compass of about four sides of foolscap.

I gladly take this occasion to state that, having had its attention drawn to the interest of the two Harvard entries in its records, one of which was printed and the other referred to by me in the *Nation* of the 8th inst., the Clothworkers' Company immediately caused facsimiles of both to be executed, and copies for presentation will soon reach your side of the Atlantic, borne by the hand of a well-known member of the Court of the Company, who is about to visit the United States.

The publication of this letter in its columns will be a sign that my suggestion is approved by the *Nation*, which will be a guarantee of the successful completion, by some means or other, of a series of Harvard facsimiles which has been so well begun.

Z.

Cambridge, Eng., April 22, 1886.

MANHOOD AGAINST STRIKERS.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: You are doubtless correct in giving Mr. Hoxie great credit for the victory—if we may call it victory while the battle is still on—over the gigantic conspiracy that has recently laid its lawless hand on the commerce and business of the Southwest. But no general wins a victory without the aid of many brave soldiers whose less conspicuous deeds go unrecorded in history. Permit me, in commending one deed of heroism, to do at least partial justice to many brave deeds that deserve perhaps equal honor.

This case comes to my knowledge through the father of the hero, whom I know to be perfectly trustworthy.

The son, whom, to avoid giving him a notoriety that might put him in further peril, we will call simply G., was employed as a brakeman on the Missouri-Pacific Railroad at the time of the strike, and was one of many who quit work, not because they wished to do so, but for other reasons which they considered convincing if not satisfactory.

After the conference of the strikers with the Governors of Missouri and Kansas had shown that the strikers had no real grievances, G. resolved to return to work. Having been threatened, he armed himself. As he came in from his first run and started for home, he was pursued by a mob of one hundred or two hundred men and boys, *led by one whom he knew to be a Knight of Labor and striker*. The conductor, also armed, was with G. These two faced and conquered the valiant Knights, and made their way to the office where it was their duty to report. The crowd pursued at a respectful distance, and, getting reinforcements, threatened to force an entrance and wreak their vengeance. G. took his place at a window overlooking the mob (the office was up stairs) and significantly took from his pocket a supply of cartridges and laid them on the window sill. By this time a cry of "Police!" arose, and the siege was raised. The two brave men were afterwards escorted home by armed police. They are at work yet, and do not intend to quit.

Another man, who was with them on the train, but took a different direction on getting off, was not so fortunate. He was assaulted by part of the same mob, and badly beaten. His wife went to his rescue with one of her female friends, and in their efforts to protect him one of the women was struck by the brave Knights.

These outrages were never reported in the newspapers. Many others perpetrated by the strikers are suppressed by the reporters, and the accounts given are colored to favor the strikers. Perhaps there is good reason for this, and the reporters are not so much to blame. Being known to the strikers, if they told the naked truth, they would receive forcible hints that their labors were not appreciated by those valiant men, and their occupation as reporters would be gone.

H.

St. Louis, Mo., April 24, 1886.

NATIONAL AID TO SCHOOL TAXATION.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Is it not possible that the money which the Blair bill now before the national House of Representatives proposes to distribute on a basis of illiteracy, to assist in educating the masses, might be so used as to avoid putting a premium on mendicancy? It is the unanimous testimony of students of popular education that schools, to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be valuable, must be supported by those who use them. It is plain that in Kentucky, at least, our public schools will never accomplish their work until the wealthy and intelligent cease to send their children at the age of twelve to boarding-school. When the better classes begin to keep their children in the public schools until a good course of study is finished, they will also begin to take an interest in these schools, to exercise care in the selection of trustees, and demand that competent teachers be chosen, comfortable houses built, and suitable furniture and apparatus supplied. This has long since proved true in Louisville and the larger towns, but in the country districts trusteeships are accepted with a feeling of condescension, as a sort of doubtful honor next in degree below a country magistracy, and the teachers' places are treated as the patronage of the trustees, to be given to daughters of relatives or neighbors. Almost never is a local tax laid to support the school, and the money coming from the State Treasury is treated as a donation to the neighborhood.

We have in this an excellent exemplification of that promotion of mendicancy which you fear. Unfortunately, our Constitution will not allow us to change this by legislative enactment. It does not follow, however, that moneys which may be voted from the national Treasury must be used in the same harmful way. It has been proposed that such moneys be set aside as a fund to foster local taxation. Whenever a district not heretofore taxing itself for schools shall levy a tax for general school purposes, or to build a school-house, it is proposed to add an equal amount from this fund; in like manner, a district increasing its local taxation for school purposes is to be aided to the extent of the increase.

That Kentucky and the South generally need better schools, that the need is much more pressing than in the North, and that it will be many years before it can be met from within, is undoubted. That the general Government, which, however unwillingly, has impoverished the South by war, and has distributed the public revenue lavishly to its soldiers, may do a gracious thing in helping educate the negro voters it has thrust upon us, and the white masses it has plunged in ignorance, is clear. The one cry of teachers, county superintentents, and all interested in our schools, is "More money!" Money—itself a mere blind force, incapable of self-direction—unwisely used, however, will undoubtedly do great harm, as you anticipate. We promise to try to use it carefully and wisely.

The other question is, Can the national Government afford it? Who will tell us?

C. H. GREATHOUSE.

LOUISVILLE, April 23, 1886.

MISTRANSLATION AGAIN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The truly laughable English version which you cite of some lines from Froebel's "Charcoal Burner" is simply another example of carelessness in translating. The original reads:

> "Und ist er auch schwarz in seinem Gesicht,
> So schadet dies seinem Herzen doch nicht,"

which might be rendered:

> "And even if sometimes black in his face,
> Such blackness his heart can never disgrace."

But there are some people who can never learn to make a distinction between *kindlich* and *kindisch*.—Respectfully, THEODORE BAKER.

DRESDEN, GERMANY, April 16, 1886.

WANTED—A NEW GRAMMAR.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR:—In the April number of "Modern Language Notes," I find an article, over the signature of Mr. Samuel Garner, which was so welcome and so strong a support to ideas which I entertain, that I would call further attention to its subject. Mr. Garner protests against the "illogical, misleading, not to say senseless proceeding, so common in our grammars and elementary books for teaching foreign languages, of translating the subjunctives in the paradigms by *may* and *might*, as though these words were the usual English equivalents." Further on: "The primary source of the erroneous practice is to be sought in the English grammars themselves, whose authors have been content to remain in the old ruts, repeating the inaccuracies of the first grammar makers, who had no scientific knowledge of the language."

I should like to see an English grammar which, among other things, discards the potential mood; gives a full and proper treatment of the infinitive and its uses; insists upon a dative and a vocative case; calls "articles" and "possessive pronouns" by their right name, "adjectives"; and through it all urges the student to use his common sense as much as his memory. Although Prof. March in his Anglo-Saxon grammar gives in paradigms the "potential" mood, and grammars of all lesser grades do the same—or worse—until Prof. Welsh even blots the subjunctive from his books, and leaves the potential to be the sole subordinate mode, yet we must confess that there was never, nor is now, a potential mood in the English language. It is a fiction of "the first grammar makers." Few grammars, so far as my limited observation goes, hint that the infinitive may have a subject; most of them expressly deny it; and in those which partially admit it, a wrong explanation is given. For instance, in Prof. Whitney's work ('Essentials'), superior to any other of its grade as it is, the statement is made (sec. 449) that "the root infinitive is used after a verb and its object, as a kind of adjunct to the latter, signifying an action in which it is concerned. . . . The construction has been *carried much beyond* its natural limits, as the object of the verb has come to *seem* a kind of subject to the infinitive." Would it not be better for the author to simply affirm, consistently with the usages of the English language from the beginning of its recorded history to the present, that in sentences like "They saw her depart," "her" *is* the subject of the infinitive "depart"? Unless grammarians do admit this—nay, insist upon it—many expressions in English cannot be parsed.

Again, few grammars mention a dative case, and when they do, disguise it as indirect objective. The indirect object (they say), like the direct, is put in the objective case, but the objective in this use is to be called the dative-objective, since it answers to the dative case of other languages. This, in the face of the fact that the English itself has always had a real dative case—not an objective "answering to the dative of other languages." The use and meaning of the case remain the same as when there was a distinctive termination to prove its existence.

On these and other points—notably the substitution of the name "possessive adjective" for "possessive pronoun"—I think the grammars of to-day can be improved. I well know there are many who have a horror of introducing into English grammar any terms or rules from the Latin; and, having always associated the terms "dative," "subject of infinitive," etc., with the Latin, they reject them from the English, forgetting that the English grammar taught in most of our schools is based upon the works of those "who had no scientific knowledge of the language," and who in consequence, when they wrote English grammar, "made up" a mass of unscientific rules, and as many, or more, exceptions, founded upon the language as it was in their day, and quite inadequate to satisfy the inquiries of any intelligent boy. Many advantages are to be claimed for this "new" grammar, chief among which are (1) the introduction it will give to the study of the grammar of foreign tongues (ancient and modern), and the consequent lessening of their difficulty; and especially (2) the development of the mind by an appeal to the reason and intelligence of the student—a training now sought in the study of the classics, and hence lacking when such study is wanting.

H. C. PENN.

CENTRAL COLLEGIATE INSTITUTE, ALTUS, ARK.

Notes.

CASSELL & Co. publish immediately the second volume of 'Actors and Actresses of Great Britain and the United States,' edited by Brander Matthews and Laurence Hutton. It includes some of the most eminent names of the English stage.

G. P. Putnam's Sons have nearly ready 'A History of France under Mazarin, with a sketch of the Administration of Richelieu,' by John Breck Perkins, in two volumes, 8vo.

Mr. Thomas Whittaker will speedily issue for summer reading a fifty-cent edition of Frederick Saunders's 'Pastime Papers.'

A new sensational novel, 'Haschisch,' is announced by Jansen, McClurg & Co.

The English Shelley Society has well in hand a 'Concordance to the Poetry of Shelley,' which it is hoped to finish in the course of two or three years.

The plates of Mrs. Dall's handy 'What We Really Know about Shakspere' (Boston: Roberts Bros.) have been carefully corrected for the second edition, now before us. It is a readable guide and book of reference to the Shaksperian sources.

A revised and enlarged edition of Dr. Edward Robinson's 'Harmony of the Four Gospels in English,' edited by Prof. M. B. Riddle, has been handsomely brought out by Houghton, Mifflin & Co. Footnotes have been added from the Revised Version, with a special bearing on the purpose of the Harmony.

In connection with the foregoing may be mentioned 'How We Got Our Bible' (London: Bagster; New York: John Wiley & Sons), a popular account, somewhat rhetorical and pedagogic, of the manuscripts and the versions, by J. Paterson Smyth.

Our notice, some months ago, of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Boston Public Latin School has apparently brought to our table a second edition of the 'History of the School of the Collegiate Reformed Dutch Church in the City of New York, from 1633 to 1883' (R. Brinkerhoff, 34 Vesey St.). This school purports to be the oldest in the United States, preceding the Boston Latin School by two years. The claim is somewhat shadowy, but no doubt the institution is a very interesting one if only for its long persistence. Being denominational, and at most only a grammar school, it had and has no such significance for New York as the Latin School for Boston. At the present time, we are glad to say, it admits other denominations besides the Dutch Reformed. The volume before us is pleasantly illustrated with maps, cuts, and portraits, and has lists of pupils for more than a century.

The 'Handbook of Plant Dissection,' composed by J. C. Arthur, Charles N. Barnes, and John M. Coulter, editors of the *Botanical Gazette* (Henry Holt & Co.), may—for shortness of reference to the authors, as well as for substance of doctrine—be called the A B C of vegetable anatomy for the laboratory work which is now much in vogue.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is one of the many adaptations of the Huxley and Martin sort of laboratory manual for elementary biology, on a system which is by this time pretty well threshed out. This one seems to have been carefully and thoughtfully prepared. Accordingly, "it is hoped that the work will be found suitable, not only for classes pursuing a regular course of lectures, but also for those who have never before studied botany, and for home use away from the assistance of a teacher." We should advise such to begin their botany in a very different and much easier way, and to defer the minute anatomy, with its *phloem* and *xylem*, to a later stage.

The 'Code of Nomenclature and Check-List of North American Birds,' adopted by the American Ornithologists' Union, and now published in a handsome volume from the University Press at Cambridge (New York: L. S. Foster, 35 Pine St.), is a thorough-going and most scholarly attempt to fix and give stability to names in this branch of zoölogy, and to determine the principles of future naming. It contains the latest and most enlightened exposition of the trinomial nomenclature imposed on scientists by the rise of the development theory, and in this particular can be commended to a much wider circle than ornithologists. There are three parts: an introduction; a formal laying down of principles, canons, and recommendations; and the check-list in three sections, of which the second is called "Hypothetical," since the birds enumerated are doubtfully North American, and the third is of fossil birds. In the check-list the classification and habitat of each bird are indicated; and, in order to diminish as much as possible the inconvenience which every change of nomenclature causes, a reference in each case is given to the corresponding entry in the four earlier standard check-lists of Baird, Coues, and Ridgway.

S. E. Cassino & Co., Boston, publish Dr. Chas. O. Whitman's 'Methods of Research in Microscopical Anatomy and Embryology,' which is the latest treatise on that form of zoölogical investigation. It is the result of studies at home and abroad, is illustrated and filled with practical directions, and is probably the best volume we have that will instruct the beginner and also assist the advanced scholar.

The literature of climatology, especially with reference to health, receives an addition in a reprint of Dr. Chas. Denison's essay on 'Moisture and Dryness' (Chicago: Jansen, McClurg & Co.), wherein the author takes the ground that dryness and elevation are the most important elements in the climatic treatment of phthisis, repudiating the idea that equability of temperature is of any special benefit. Dr. Denison insists that an equable climate is essentially a damp climate, and a damp climate is a purgatory leading the consumptive to lower depths. The pamphlet is well supplied with weather maps and statistics, and is worthy of study by pulmonary invalids and those in charge of them.

The secondary title of Dr. J. Leonard Corning's 'Brain Rest,' namely, "A Disquisition on the Curative Properties of Prolonged Sleep" (Putnams), and the fact that ten lines of the title-page are occupied with his credentials, pretty fairly indicate the literary style of this essay. Besides an involved discussion on the theory of sleep, which may be referred to the medical faculty without our comment, the central idea is the regulation of the cerebral circulation by certain mechanical devices. It is too distinctly a professional book for analysis here, or for laymen to read with profit.

The '*Harvard Advocate* Catalogue—1866-1886' consists of a well-written sketch of college journalism at Harvard, with especial reference to the rise and fortunes of the *Harvard Advocate*, now twenty years old. This has been composed, almost without the aid of records, and hence very laboriously, by Mr. T. T. Baldwin, of the present editorial staff. An appendix contains a register of all the editors from the commencement, with their occupation, address, etc., and their "publications." From this last particular it appears that out of 143 graduate editors more than a third have become authors of books, or writers for the periodical press. Even the "business editor" is occasionally found in this category. The college library has in past years been benefited to the extent of $500 by the profits of the *Advocate*.

The *Southern Bivouac* for May has a final paper on the Resolutions of 1798-99, and a sketch of the life of John Breckinridge. In this paper Mr. Durrett discloses the interesting accident by which the copy of the Resolutions and the letter of Jefferson came into his hands. They had, it seems, been among the papers of James D. Breckinridge, a nephew of John, and had been sold after his death without discovery of their valuable character. The Resolutions Mr. Durrett compared not only with the printed acts and journals of the Kentucky Legislature, and with a contemporaneous publication in the *Palladium* and the *Kentucky Gazette*, but with the official copy sent to the Massachusetts Legislature. This completes the authentication by the method we formerly spoke of as the satisfactory one, and which our correspondent President Welling first informed us had been followed. The way is now open for the other interesting question, How can we account for the incorrect copy in 'Elliott's Debates on the Constitution'?

The opening article in the *Antiquary* for April is by Mr. Frederick Hodgetts on the "Scandinavian Elements in the English Race"—a point of view which is too much overlooked in the study of English institutions. This article, descriptive of Scandinavian life, does not throw so much direct light upon English life as we had hoped; but it is to be continued. "London Rogues and Relief of Distress Three Centuries Ago," by Dr. Charles Gross (an American writer), is a valuable contribution to the history of charities, consisting of a city ordinance of 1579, which contains many regulations observed at the present day; *e. g.*, the last article calls upon "Citizens, Artificers, and other, and also all farmers and other for husbandry, and gentlemen and other for their kitchins, and other services, to take servants and children both out of Bridewell and Christ's Hospitall, etc." Most of the other articles are continued from former numbers, and are of considerable interest.

The leading and in fact the only general article in *Le Livre* for April is an account of Dickens's second visit to Paris in 1855, by R. Du Pontavice; just as the only illustration is an etching after "Phiz's" full-length seated sketch of "Boz."

'Assyria; its Princes, Priests, and People' is the title of a new popular volume by Professor Sayce, published by the Religious Tract Society of London, in the collection marked "By-Paths of Bible Knowledge," of which it forms the seventh number. Like several other of the author's frequent productions in the same field, it contains, side by side with information alike instructive and new to most readers, some that has been often repeated with little variation by the same pen. It repeats, however, little of what was given, under the title 'Assyrian Life and History,' in M. E. Harkness's contribution to the same collection (No. ii.). What is strange, and slightly unfair toward the purchasers of the whole series, is that the eight illustrations after the monuments, attached to Mr. Sayce's book —Monolith of Shalmaneser II., Assurbani-pal and his Queen, etc.—are identical with eight out of the nine contained in the earlier Assyrian volume of the "By-Paths."

The anonymous author of 'Bismarck nach dem Kriege,' 'Bismarck—12 Jahre deutscher Politik,' 'Bismarck in Frankfurt,' and 'Bismarck in Petersburg—Paris—Berlin,' has added another volume to his cycle of sketches of the German Chancellor. The new book is entitled 'Bismarck in Versailles.' It is divided into twelve sections, whose titles—"The League of Neutrals, down to the Blockade of Paris," "The Provisioning of Paris," "Trochu's Preparations," etc.—make one suspect that the writer uses the name which he places at the head of his publication only as a convenient and taking sign for a medley of loosely connected chapters on the great Franco-German war, without having much to say about the diplomatic hero of it during his stay in the French city which witnessed the proclamation of the new German Empire. The perusal of some scores of pages will convince the reader that the biographical element in this fifth 'Bismarck' of the prolific anonymous—who marks his identity by three asterisks—is infinitesimal, and that his history, too, is only a readable rehash of oft-repeated narratives, with hardly the addition of a new fact, anecdote, or view.

Of the various historico-political year-books in English, German, French, etc., which serve as retrospective summaries of events and partial supplements to encyclopædias, André Daniel's 'L'Année Politique,' now in its twelfth year, is one of the least comprehensive, but also one of the most readable. It gives only fugitive glimpses of affairs in the minor states, and incomparably more space to France alone than to the rest of the world; and is thus, to readers outside of the French Republic, chiefly valuable as an addition to such publications as W. Müller's yearly 'Politische Geschichte der Gegenwart,' the 'Annual Register,' or Appletons' 'Annual Cyclopædia.' Within its narrower sphere, however, it is full, pleasantly discursive, and bright. The "Introduction" to the year 1885 exhibits the author in a gloomy, patriotic mood. He sees the republic passing through a dangerous crisis, for the severity of which all parties—Opportunists, Radicals, reactionaries—are almost equally to blame: "Ni à droite ni à gauche il n'y a de mœurs politiques. . . . L'affaissement général des caractères a fait d'effrayant progrès; la France entière semble épuisée; . . . partout l'épicurisme intellectuel ou matériel et l'égoisme d'individu ou de classe."

—In the *Century* for May Mr. Julian Hawthorne gives us a second study of the philosophy of his father's works, but it is of less interest than his analysis of the morality of the 'Scarlet Letter.' In it he deals almost wholly with the short stories and allegories, and is occupied rather with disengaging the elements of Hawthorne's personality in his earlier literary life, and with unfolding the moral purpose and insight as one of these. He thinks that the secluded years which Hawthorne spent in meditation and laborious experiment with his genius were made more tolerable by a very proud ambition, and the half-satirical expectation that his fame would some day burst forth and the world suddenly awake to the knowledge that a man had been among them who was a prophet. Incidentally the writer also shows how thoroughly Hawthorne rejected the modern world. He was not a reformer, we all know, but in his retirement there was more than mere social separation, more than simple natural reserve; his disapproval of the order about him was a rational and moral dissent, of which the indirect expression may be easily noticed. He had the iconoclastic spirit of 1835, though he broke no images. The religious article of the number is an attempt to show that evolution is a doctrine which may be Christianized, and, when it has been sufficiently humbled by the process, be ac-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cepted into the scientific faith of the church. It is, perhaps, too metaphysical to be convincing to any but a theological thinker; it appeals to the religion of the study, not to that of the people. Articles on "Country Dwellings," "The Flour Mills of Minneapolis," the "Lick Observatory," and "Fancy Pigeons," furnish the illustrations. A sonnet to Mrs. Jackson, by Col. Higginson, is an unusual feature.

—*Lippincott's* reminds us that Thoreau was a poet, and prints once more the exquisitely classical lines on "Smoke." These are sufficient to justify the article, but the other selections show at most only unworked ore. Thoreau wrote some good verses with Emerson's hand, of whom he was at times the direct inspiration; but the lines he himself penned are of little value, except to emphasize the fact that the charm by virtue of which he exceeds other literary naturalists springs from his poetic temperament. He saw things in an atmosphere of thought, and shining with the beauty which is felt only in their suggestions. In his formal poetry the lack of art is fatal to enjoyment. The difference between poetic prose and prosaic poetry is that in the case of the former one looks up, and with the latter one looks down: he is on a different level of expectation. The iridescence struck by a sudden glint of light is pleasant to see, but it is not the rainbow. Let it be enough for Thoreau to stand first among our rustic lovers of nature, and to have made our fields and woods more friendly to us; he showed us where the laurel grows, but he never plucked it. The second and last couplets of the lines on "Smoke" so different a man as Landor might have written. Austin Dobson contributes a poem, and Andrew Lang and Julian Hawthorne curious stories. The Society for Psychical Research seems to be affecting literature, to judge from these and other examples. The ghosts of Mrs. Radcliffe and Monk Lewis have become scientific, but they are the same old ghosts broke loose from the literary graveyard of the last century.

—The work, in two volumes, entitled 'Johnson's New General Encyclopædia and Copper-Plate Hand-Atlas of the World' (A. J. Johnson & Co.), and which is an abridgment of 'Johnson's Universal Cyclopædia' with additions and corrections to date, frankly assumes to share the merits of the parent work. To those who know the latter this is an advertisement that its defects —its unevenness and its want not of editors, but of editing—are retained in the abridgment: the stream cannot, in such a case, without the greatest labor and at corresponding cost, rise higher than its source. The latest date that we have observed in the body of this encyclopædia is January 27, 1885, that of the death of General Gordon at Khartum: but the Appendix was apparently closed some time in March. The use, therefore, of the present tense and the perfect definite in the notices of Emerson and Phillips, who died in 1882 and 1884 respectively, is evidence of careless revision; the failure to note the date of the death of James Watson Webb in 1884 is an oversight which should have been avoided. The French troubles in Anam, Tonquin, and Madagascar were flagrant in 1883, but Tonquin has no article to itself, and in neither of the other two is there any allusion to hostilities with the French; and yet the Congo Free State, down to November, 1884, is duly recognized in the Appendix. In regard to biographies it is true of the abridgment as of the original that it is very rich in obscure or hardly-made names, that "have but a temporary notoriety, and in future years may disappear," but meantime are conveniently embalmed here. Nevertheless, the fresh editing takes no account of as prominent men of the time as Joseph Chamberlain and Henry Fawcett in politics, or of Edgar Fawcett, Henry George, Joel C. Harris, Helen Hunt Jackson, Henry James (save for one line under the notice of his late father), in literature, or of E. S. Holden in science. We might extend this list, but we have instanced only names to which articles are allowed in Dr. Thomas's 'Biographical Dictionary,' which went to press at the same time with the 'Encyclopædia.' Robert G. Ingersoll is twice set down as Robert *J.*—in a cross-reference and in the Appendix. In short, not to multiply fault-finding, this work, like so many of its class, must be taken for what it brings, and its accuracy must be tested by other authorities. Much that is curious and helpful here would hardly be sought in its place, *e. g.*, "Great Circle Sailing," and "Centre of U. S. Population," or (as singular a freak as any we have observed) "Labienus, Les Propos de," the title of a political satire under the Second Empire, which one would not have expected to find in a list from which the 'Odyssey' is excluded.

—It was in 1837 that Heine wrote concerning Liszt: "I need not refer to his talent, for his fame extends over Europe. He is unquestionably the artist who has in Paris the most enthusiastic admirers, but also the most rabid opponents." Half a century has not greatly altered the situation. The extraordinary enthusiasm with which Liszt has been lately received in Paris and London, after an absence of many years, is perhaps without a parallel in the history of music. On the other hand, he still has opponents—no longer, however, as a pianist, as in the days of Thalberg, but as a composer. As Liszt's music is but little known in Paris and London, the ovation tendered him in those cities had reference to the great pianist and musical educator rather than the creator; but the numerous Liszt concerts attending the festivities may have cleared away many of the prejudices against his music fostered by ignorant scribblers. The well-known historian, Dr. Langhans, was in London when the first Liszt concert was given, and writes to the Berlin *Boersen-Courier* that on no other occasion within his memory did Liszt's personality produce so great an impression as here. "At the public rehearsal already the 2,100 seats in the hall were all sold; the applause which arose when the aged composer made his appearance lasted several minutes, and when, in the course of the rehearsal, he had taken his place in front of the orchestra, in order to express his intentions by an occasional word or gesture, the public was more eye than ear. But what extraordinary internal and external harmony is required by a person who is the object of such universal attention, in order not to 'lose his balance'! Who could avoid 'posing' in some manner on feeling that thousands of eyes were fixed on him? Liszt is this magician, for not a movement, not a look shows that he is in the least embarrassed. This absolute naturalness, this antique beauty and geniality, is doubtless the real cause of the magic spell he exercises over others." The performance of Liszt's "St. Elizabeth" gave Langhans an opportunity to note the two points in which musical England excels—soloists and chorus. The former excellence may be traced to the long supremacy of Italian music, the latter to the cultivation of the oratorio. "The tonal beauty, the energy and fire of the chorus showed distinctly that one was in a country which, since the days of Handel, has been the special home of the oratorio. Overwhelming, too, was the effect of the chorus of angels, in the second part, sung by a chorus of boys in an elevated gallery." Liszt protests that his pupils, Rubinstein, Bülow, and Saint-Saëns, play better now than he does; nevertheless he was prevailed upon to play some Hungarian and Chopin compositions. As contrasted with his former heaven-storming style, one critic remarks that now "Liszt is the mildest of the mild. His touch, even at seventy-five years, is still exquisite. His fingers seem to be hardly in contact with the keyboard. He appears to caress the keys, in order to produce a tone at once incomparable and indescribable." Another critic says:

"The production of tone is most extraordinary. He makes the piano sigh and sing. You do not hear notes struck with the fingers and sounding *piano* or *forte*, but lovely and enchanting sounds floating as it were in the air, and with infinite gradations of tone from soft to loud. The pianissimos are not soft-pedal pianissimos; the fortissimos are not hard or noisy; the means between these extremes are not cold or colorless. The tone is always pure and beautiful. With his magic touch he works wonders, and you feel rather than hear the music. The exquisitely finished style adds, too, to the charm of the performance; and some of his greatest effects are produced by making everything sound not as a studied piece, but as an inspired improvisation. How well this suits the national Hungarian music need scarcely be said."

—To the credit of the London press be it said that there were few ignorant denunciations of Liszt's music. Liszt has been quite as badly misrepresented by the press as Wagner, and has often indulged in fits of pessimism. In a letter to Herbeck, dated 1875, and printed for the first time in the current number of the *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*, he declares that "an artist reckons without his host if he honestly trusts himself to the public. People hear and judge only by reading the newspapers. Why produce music for people who only wish to read the papers?" And in another letter he urges Herbeck to give his "Prometheus" in Vienna: "This Herculean task is specially adapted for you. Mighty eagles, lacerating the Titan's liver, there are none, it is true—but in their place a whole host of ravens and vermin."

—The April number of *Les Lettres et les Arts* (Boston: Schoenhof) opens near the middle at two charming pages in the most delicate green tints of spring time: Kaemerer's youthful female figure in an April garden, and, opposite, a maze of blossoming boughs and nests and birds surrounding the perfect little poem of Pierre de Nolhac, 'Le Chanson de printemps.' A sonnet by Armand Silvestre illustrates the fine etching by Henner, "La Nymphe," which forms the frontispiece. M. Léo Delibes gives six pages of music to accompany the wild poem "Gai! Tsigane!" which François Coppée has adapted from the Hungarian Petöfi, and which Clairin has accompanied by two expressive and characteristic illustrations. M. Henry Cazalis writes with enthusiasm of the sixty aquarelles illustrating the fables of La Fontaine, which M. Gustave Moreau has devoted four years to producing for a wealthy amateur of Paris. Judging from the praises of M. Cazalis and from the reproductions of several of the water-colors themselves here given, the artist has certainly not succeeded in making his illustrations illustrate La Fontaine. There is no trace of the gayety and lightness of touch of the poet in the sombre and overwhelming creations of the aquarellist, which suggest the artistic possession that Zola expresses in his last terrible book, 'L'Œuvre.' The present number of the *Revue* seems to represent very fully in its illustrations the spirit of his *plein-airistes*, and it is this, perhaps, which gives it, more than anything else, the charm of unexpectedness and unlikeness to its predecessors that characterizes *Les Lettres et les Arts*. The most satisfying thing in the number is the short paper by M. Jacques Saugé, 'La Ronde de nuit,' with its brilliant reproduction of M. Waltner's rendering of Rembrandt's famous picture, and the etching by Rajon of Gérôme's "Rembrandt dans son atelier," and two exquisite small heads. From a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

literary point of view the most valuable and suggestive article is "La Renaissance en Allemagne avant la Réforme," by M. Jules Zeller.

—It has a rather ominous look for the authenticity of the 'Königinhof Manuscript' and 'Grünberg Manuscript'—those Ossianic treasures of the Bohemian nation—that a new and thorough investigation of it is advocated by a first-class Czech antiquary and philologist, Prof. G bauer, of Prague, and that in the *Athenæum*, a periodical issued under the auspices of the Czech University of that city. Attacks on the 'Königinhof Manuscript' have but rarely and faintly come from national Bohemian quarters, though 'The Judgment of Libusha,' so mysteriously discovered shortly after Hanka's alleged great "find" in a lumber corner of the church steeple at Königinhof, September 16, 1817, was violently denounced as a fraud by the patriarch of Bohemian Slavists, the Abbé Dobrovsky, and many of his disciples, and has always been half-heartedly defended. The 'Love Song of King Wenceslas,' 'Libusha's Prophecy,' and other minor fragments of ancient Bohemian poetry have been given up by the most obstinate Czech scholars, and Hanka's and his helper Svoboda's complicity in those mystifications are, though very reluctantly, admitted by many. But the epics and lyrics of Königinhof, the very late attacks on which—in the last three decades—by Feifallik, Max Büdinger, and others, were met with as much zeal as learning by the veteran historian Palacky and the Jireceks, possess a kind of religious sanctity in the eyes of Bohemian nationalists. Those poems, which were to prove that there was a grand Homeric school of popular bards in Bohemia, more than a century, and possibly many centuries, before John Huss preached in Prague, have done more than any other production by a Czech to resuscitate and regenerate the Bohemian language, and rouse the national sentiment, in our century. Whether Hanka honestly or dishonestly brought to light the 'Královdorsky Rukopis'—whether, if it was a forgery, he did his part for the sake of notoriety or, as Kopitar says, "cœco patriæ amore abreptus"—the fact stands that he has made history. The Czechs were right in nationally celebrating, in September, 1867, the semicentenary anniversary of the appearance of the parchment strips of Königinhof, even though the 'Rukopis' may only have been *ben trovato*. "If this banknote be forged," a stanch Bohemian is reported lately to have said, "well, we have bought too much for it—our national regeneration, our poetic literature." The literature on the subject is immense; a full, though nationally partial, historical and bibliographical exposé is contained in Vlach and Helfert's 'Die Cecho-Slaven' (1883).

EARLY ARABIAN KINSHIP AND MARRIAGE.

Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia. By W. Robertson Smith, Lord Almoner's Professor of Arabic in the University of Cambridge. Cambridge: At the University Press. 1885. Pp. xiv, 322.

Professor Smith states that in his discussion he has followed the line of investigation laid down by the late Mr. J. F. McLennan in his works on primitive marriage, kinship, and the patriarchate. The problem being to determine what was the development of customs of kinship and marriage, Mr. McLennan undertakes to establish the following positions: the most ancient system of blood kinship was through women only, and this by reason of the uncertainty of fatherhood; the primitive promiscuity accompanied by female infanticide was followed by capture of wives and exogamy, these by polyandry of various sorts through which the advance was made to male kinship; the primitive groups were, or were assumed to be, homogeneous; the rule of female kinship tended to make exogamous groups heterogeneous; next arose kinship through both females and males, then kinship through males alone, dependent on the development of the idea of fatherhood; this kinship tended to produce homogeneous groups, whence, from difficulty of intermarriage in such a group, there again came into play marriage by capture and the evolution of capture; under the condition of exogamy and female kinship there arose heterogeneity, with marriage within the tribe; such a tribe easily grew into a caste; and such a group, having come to feel its unity, would naturally feign a common ancestor. These are the conditions which Professor Smith seeks to find in the old Arabic life. He has conducted his investigation with such wealth of learning and carefulness of discrimination as fairly entitle his book to the name of an independent work. He has gone for the most part to original sources, and shows the same acuteness of observation and felicity of illustration that have appeared in his former works. He brings out a multitude of curious details in connection with the ancient Arabian society, and with old Semitic life in general, including the Old Testament.

It is well known that the surviving Arabic literature of the pagan period is of very small extent, and what we have has been in part worked over by later Moslem editors and traces of paganism obliterated. It is to be expected, therefore, that the history of the earlier times should be found not so much in direct statement as in the remains of customs and institutions; these are to be interrogated, and their testimony to the most ancient condition of things carefully sifted. What, now, may we hold to be the established results of such an inquiry?

Professor Smith makes it probable that the earliest bond of kinship in Arabia was through women only. This is the most natural explanation of the occurrence of female eponyms. Nöldeke's suggestion that these names simply arise from the fact that Arabic collective nouns are feminine, hardly accounts for the phenomena. That the tribe should represent its ancestor as a woman points to a time when relationship was reckoned through women. The number of such eponyms in the Arabian tribes is not small, and in the Jewish tradition we have such names as Sarah, Rebecca, Leah, and Rachel. If from the earliest period kinship had been reckoned through males, it would be very difficult to account for the occurrence of such traditions. There is, further, the heathen Arabic rule of bars to marriage which were only on the female side. In other primitive societies we find such a rule of prohibited degrees always connected with female kinship, and there seems no reason to suppose another explanation here.

Prof. Smith finds no direct proof that the ancient Arabs had a practice of exogamy—that is, a custom forbidding marriage within the tribe. In historical times they were certainly not endogamous—that is, marriage without the tribe was not forbidden; for there are mentioned numerous cases of intermarriages between different tribes. But when we compare the general progress of society in Arabia and in other primitive communities, we find in the former conditions which are commonly associated in the latter with exogamy.

When Mohammed established his legislation, the patriarchal and patronymic organization was already fully in existence. The husband was the head of the family; the children took the father's name, and were reckoned to his tribe; the husband had almost complete authority over both wife and children. But there was then also in existence another sort of marriage, called by the Arabians *mota*, which Mohammed endeavored to abolish. This was a contract entered into between husband and wife for a definite period, the parties being of equal authority—that is to say, the wife enjoying an independence which did not belong to her under the later condition of things. There are, moreover, traces of still another form of marriage, freer and more primitive than the *mota*, in which the woman was the principal party. Living in her own tribe and in her own house, the woman seems to have been permitted to receive at will husbands from other tribes, to have entertained them at her pleasure, and to have been entirely independent of them in her movements. Her children were then reckoned to her tribe. McLennan has designated by the term *beena* those temporary marriages in which the husband went to live with his wife; Mr. Smith includes marriages of the *mota* and *beena* types under the name *sadic*, as a designation of all those marriages where the wife is not under the husband's authority, but meets him on equal terms. A number of examples in illustration of this custom might be cited from the ancient history. Thus, the famous Hatim was chosen as husband by Mawiya, was received by her in her own tent, and was dismissed by her at her own pleasure, because she found his generosity intolerable. In the *Aghani*, xvi, 106, it is said: "Women in the Time of Ignorance, or some of them, had the right to dismiss their husbands, and the form of dismissal was this: If they lived in a tent, they turned it round, so that if the door had faced east it now faced west; and when the man saw this he knew that he was dismissed, and did not enter." And so the tent belonged to the woman, and the husband was received by her at her own will. It is this custom that seems to be referred to in the Hebrew expression "to go in unto," as a synonym of marriage—that is, to go into the wife's tent (compare 2 Sam., xvi, 22).

Back of such marriage arrangements, however, there seems to have existed in Arabia a custom of polyandry. For Yemen Prof. Smith cites the direct testimony of Strabo, 16, 4. Indirect testimony he finds in the story given in Bokhari, 6, 114, where a man goes halves in wives with his adopted brother, a procedure that would never have occurred to one but from a preceding custom of polyandry. The same thing might be inferred from the signification of the word *kanna*, which means both spouse and daughter-in-law, and thus points to the time when a woman might occupy a position of wife to a group of men, and her children be reckoned to the group and not to any particular man. McLennan makes two types of polyandry, which he calls the Nair and the Tibetan; in the former, the more primitive, the woman is the wife of a group of men not related to one another; in the latter she is the wife of all the brothers of a family. Of the early existence of this Tibetan polyandry among the Semites, there is indirect evidence: for example, among the Hebrews the custom of levirate marriage, the brother marrying the widow of his deceased brother, the first son of the new marriage being reckoned to the deceased husband. See Matthew xxii, 25-26, a condition which represents accurately the remains of a custom of Tibetan polyandry.

Beyond this point the data of early Semitic life do not reach. In certain other early societies we find that such polyandry was preceded by promiscuity (not, apparently, by communal marriage). Prof. Smith very properly limits himself to the discussion of the facts of Arabic life actually known, and does not attempt conjectures as to the earliest possible period.

Another class of facts which McLennan has brought into prominence and which Smith here

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

discusses is embraced under the name totemism. A totem is an animal from which the tribe takes its name, of whose blood it believes itself to be, and which it reveres as a deity. Now in Arabia and in the old Israelitish territory a considerable number of tribe-names (for example, the Calebites or Dogs) derived from animals is found. Often a large tribe contains a number of subtribes, all claiming the animal name, having each its own separate name in addition. There are some facts which might lead us to believe that these animals were old deities, and were held by the tribes to be of their own blood, such as the stories common in the 'Thousand and One Nights' of the transformation of men into beasts, the refusal by Mohammed to eat certain animals because of their apparent relationship to man, and especially the old custom of prohibited foods. This seems to be the most natural explanation of the Hebrew laws relating to animals classed as "unclean," that is, not as physically impure or hurtful, but as sacred and prohibited. The probability is that the unclean animals mentioned in Deut. xiv., Lev. xi., are deities of heathen worship. Professor Smith points out that the term "abomination" is applied in the Old Testament only to the prohibited foods and to heathen gods. There are a few traces among the ancient Arabs of the worship of animals; naturally such traces would easily disappear in Moslem times.

Professor Smith's book is welcome as an introductory investigation in a very interesting and important field. He has been able, as he says, to give only a brief sketch of the material, and more accurate results must follow from wider investigations. The literatures of the other Semitic peoples should be worked up, and Arabic literature itself needs a more thorough study. But it may be said that Mr. Smith has made it probable that the earliest Arabic society of which we have distinct traces is polyandrous; that there was thence an advance to a form of marriage in which the woman was independent; that this was succeeded by the marriage of Mohammed's time called by Smith *baal*, in which the wife was virtually the property of the husband; that kinship was originally through the mother alone; that there then came a time of conflict during which groups formed by female kinship were gathered together and became homogeneous; and, finally, that when the family came into existence, under the form first of Tibetan polyandry and then of monandry, the system of male kinship was introduced. Professor Smith seems to have had in mind not only the English, but also the Continental literature of his subject.

TOLSTOI AND TURGENEFF.

Anna Karénina. By Count Lyof N. Tolstoï. In eight parts. Translated by Nathan Haskell Dole. Thomas Y. Crowell & Co.

Among the last letters which Turgeneff wrote was one from his deathbed to Count Lyof Tolstoi. "I write to you with my own hand," he said, "to tell you that I am glad to have been your contemporary, and to express to you a last, sincere request. My friend, the great writer of the Russian land, grant my prayer: return to literature." He had already, in 1880, sent to Tolstoi an extract from a letter to himself, in which Gustave Flaubert expressed his thanks for having been made to read the French translation of 'War and Peace'—"unfortunately very inferior," adds Turgeneff. "It is of the highest order," said Flaubert. "What a painter! what a psychologist! The first two volumes are *sublime;* but the third deteriorates frightfully. He repeats himself! and he philosophizes! At last one sees the gentleman, the author, and the Russian, while up to that point one had seen only Nature and Humanity. It seems to me that there are at times things truly Shaksperian in it! I uttered cries of admiration during my perusal of it; and it is long! Yes, it is powerful! very powerful!"

Turgeneff, as we know from his letters, wrote with great effort. It required much urging from his friends and his own conscience before he could be induced to put pen to paper. This indifference he attributed to his long residence abroad, which, whatever effect it may have had in that direction, certainly tinged his view of Russia and his countrymen, and developed an epigrammatic terseness of style which does not characterize his 'Annals of a Sportsman.' But with all our admiration for the exquisite finish of his workmanship, it is hard to imagine that he could ever have written in that fervid condition of heart and brain which does not permit of deliberate pauses to weigh the effect of every word and to calculate the turn of every phrase. How Count Tolstoi writes we are not informed, but any one who reads him in the original soon becomes breathless at the earnestness and rapidity with which chapter after chapter seems to have been dashed off and never afterwards revised—an earnestness so concentrated and glowing that the reader seems to feel at once the heart-beats of the characters as they are introduced, and, above them all, the passionate throb of the author's own heart, with an almost personal sense of his very presence. This dash results in an apparent indifference to some of the commonest rules of writing and of novel-manufacture, in which far inferior performers excel. It is not uncommon for him to repeat himself on the same page, to begin several consecutive sentences with the same name in the most awkward manner, to contradict his own statements. Thus Várenka, in 'Anna Karenina,' is made to wear a yellow dress and a white one in the same breath (both are omitted from the translation), and Vronsky's wealth in Italy is not accounted for after the description of his embarrassed circumstances in St. Petersburg. But this habitual disregard for nice points does not detract from the effect, and it serves to accentuate still more strongly the contrast between Tolstoi's ardent temperament and Turgeneff's phlegmatic nature. The latter would never have permitted such technically imperfect work to leave his hands, but, with all his art, he appears cold beside his brother writer. It may be argued, and with some justice, that the removal of these blemishes by a translator is an improvement; but it interferes with the proper psychological study of the author, whose personality is as interesting as any of his characters, in the same degree that the mistakes foisted upon Turgeneff, by the same means, prevent a proper appreciation of him.

The methods of the two writers are as different as their styles. Turgeneff viewed all Russian subjects and people from a double standpoint—that of an impartial foreigner, who regarded Russians as new and curious animals to be studied, and that of a native, who understands thoroughly the manners and customs of his country. An epigrammatic and critical treatment is the natural result of this. Tolstoi's method is the exact reverse. He never consciously treats his characters as Russians, nor does he criticise them. He simply becomes, for the time being, an integral part of the mind and of the very essence of the character whom he is depicting. Nevertheless, no one can deny that his characters are as genuinely Russian as any of Turgeneff's creations. But they are something more—they are universal types. The situations in 'Smoke' and 'Anna Karenina' are sufficiently similar to render a comparison interesting. Vronsky deserts Kitty for Anna, as Litvinoff deserts Tania for Irene. After showing us the fashionable Russians at Baden-Baden, with their airy French, superlatively fresh clothes, and elaborate grace of manner, picnicking in the morning and mesmerizing their crab in the utter inanity of their evening, Turgeneff exhibits another set behaving like lunatics at Gubareff's rooms, and then confides the task of summing up Russia as a whole to Potugin. Like Pigasoff in 'Rudin,' Potugin does little but utter pithy criticisms, which, though highly amusing, are as unpalatable to the victims as are certain Anglo-American sketches to people in this country. After giving the impression that high-class Russians are frivolous, narrow-minded, and overburdened with foreign affectations, and that Russia is utterly devoid of originality, the story proceeds. But there is very little analysis of character, or of the motives and feelings which inspire any course of conduct. The people and events are simply photographed under a brilliant light, and the reader is left to supply the rest, as he is in the dramas which go on about him in real life. Irene is frail, shallow, heartless—eminently Russian, if we are to believe the author. No one will ever pause to inquire Anna Karenina's nationality; she will be accepted unquestioningly, in her weakness and remorse, as a world type by any one who has once followed the vivid history of her mental processes.

Varvara, in 'A Nobleman's Nest,' is another example of the same eminently national delineation. Tania hardly appears on the scene, any more than Natalia in 'Rudin,' and much less than Lisa in 'A Nobleman's Nest.' All three lose their lovers through the interference of a married woman. That they are all strong characters is evident enough; but Turgeneff is very reserved in his portraits of young girls, and the reader never feels that he has been very thoroughly introduced to them. They are simply the ideal young girl of romance. Irene at first forms an exception. But Tolstoi's young girls are among the most wonderful of his creations. Had Kitty been dropped after the description of her feelings at Vronsky's desertion, as Turgeneff's girls are, she would still have lived in the hearts and memories of all readers. As Levin's wife she reigns equally as the typical young married woman. Natasha, in 'War and Peace,' is an example, quite as perfectly drawn, of another type—the fickle, forward, capricious girl, who eventually settles down with the last and most unexpected of her many admirers, and develops into the most domestic of matrons, without a care for her appearance or an idea beyond her much-governed husband and children. That Levin is an autobiographical sketch is generally accepted, and there are portions of Pierre Besukhof's story which seem to come under the same head. Yet he is not a whit more true to nature than any other character in the author's two great novels. Lavretzky, in 'A Nobleman's Nest,' is somewhat similar to Aleksei Karenina, but the contrast is as marked in this case as in the others. Like Litvinof, he forms the subject of a psychological study within the narrow limits to which Turgeneff restricted himself, or was restricted by his lack of sympathy. One curious result of the latter's attempts at analysis is, that the people to whom he devotes the most of his attention in that line turn out the weakest characters, and eventually fade out of the story in a nerveless way, which speedily banishes them also from the reader's mind, leaving behind, in vivid colors, only the portraits of the brave young girls who suffer unanalyzed in silence. "All is smoke," says Litvinoff. "Words, words, that is all," echoes Rudin; if Lavretzky does not utter the sentiment, he feels it. The married women are too shallow to dissect. The young girls do not yield their secret hearts to his touch.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In short, Turgeneff's art is always apparent, and never more so than when he is contrasted with Tolstoi, whose utter absence of that quality (consciously and deliberately, at least) results in something as much above any deliberate artistic product as a rose or a tree is beyond the utmost effort of a painter or a flower maker. But, although Tolstoi appeals more directly to the heart than Turgeneff, the latter never appears so well as when read directly after one of the former's great works. They complement each other in a marked manner and to a singular degree, and, united, they reveal Russian life in a way that is fairly startling in its vividness.

Of 'Anna Karenina' it is unnecessary to speak in detail. The general remarks which were made in these columns a short time ago with regard to the translation of the 'War and Peace' apply with equal force to this. It was made directly from the French, not from the Russian, and the proofs begin in chapter two. The French version is very much cut, not as a concession to a more delicate taste (one passage is omitted for that reason), but in order to shorten the book. Occasionally, the American translator restores a paragraph to make the sense clearer. Sometimes he omits something essential, as on page 567. The inference is, as it now stands, that Levin was actuated by jealousy when he sent the coachman back instead of allowing Vasenka to go. He is merely anxious that his Don Cossack horse should not be injured by Vasenka's weight, which is about 240 pounds. The parenthesis which explains this is retained in the French, though the chapter is much cut in both versions. The omission of many details connected with Levin's life and experiments on his estate is especially to be regretted. They would have supplied in abundance that "local color" which the translator has depended upon untranslated words to reproduce. The latter merely baffle and disconcert the reader. Housekeepers will be interested to learn that the Princess's new way of cooking raspberries was the method commonly employed in this country—without water. Levin did not indulge in acrobatic exercises beside his brother's death-bed by "trying to stand on tiptoe." He "tried to leave the room on tiptoe." The French also is wrong here. But while the American translator follows the French so closely (as a rule) that he even writes *non*, where the Russian *no* is used, he sometimes departs from it without gaining much. *Peignoir* was a perfectly adequate rendering for *koftochka*, which Mr. Dole gives as a *jersey* (jerseys were not invented at that time). The *tensely-drawn* brow of Levin's skeleton-like brother on his death-bed reads *bald* in the French, and *yellow* in the English. It is not worth while to cite more examples. The translator has fallen to the ground between two stools. The Russian was undoubtedly at hand and referred to, as the preface states, but with the result of confusion rather than improvement in most cases, and a translation from the French, not in a "few passages," but as a whole. It is a disappointment. To quote the words of a Russian who is accomplished both in that language and in English: "It makes the heart bleed to see the havoc that is made with beautiful things." Turgeneff and Tolstoi deserve better treatment than they have received; and though they are great enough to rise superior to misrepresentation, only those who can make their acquaintance in their own magnificent language will ever be able fully to appreciate them.

Lebenserinnerungen. Von Levin Schücking. Breslau und Leipzig: S. Schottlaender. 1886. 2 Bde.

We have in these memoirs of the recently deceased Westphalian poet and novelist, Levin Schücking, two very engaging volumes. As autobiography they show the touch of a literary artist, and disclose at the same time a character that commands admiration. The author had won for himself a distinct and honorable place in the imaginative literature of his country, and the story of his life was thus well worth telling for its own sake alone. Added to this, however, is the fact that through his experience as a journalist he had had exceptional opportunities for becoming acquainted with a large number of the men of letters who were most prominently before the eyes of the German people during the decade that immediately preceded the revolutionary outbreaks of 1848. Students of these men and of the epoch in which they lived and worked will find Schücking's memoirs a valuable source of information. The volumes are interesting from beginning to end.

Levin Schücking was born in Westphalia in 1814. His native province is not famed as a producer of poets or as a nourisher of the poetic temperament, but Schücking himself attaches no little importance to his having been born a Westphalian. With evident feeling and with fine literary skill he describes the home of his boyhood, not far from Münster: the fantastic old castle in which his father, a judicial magistrate, had taken up his official residence; the forest of pines that surrounded the castle, and the dreams and fancies which this sombre environment bred in his own boyish mind. He tells us, too, of his early attempts at poetic creation, and of his fondness for the Waverley novels, which it was his agreeable office to read aloud to the family over and over again, only now and then exchanging Scott for some freshly arrived book of Irving or of Cooper. "Walter Scott," he observes, "has exercised great influence upon my whole way of thinking," and he digresses into a short essay upon the philosophy of Toryism. "There was always a good bit of the Tory in me," so the digression concludes, "and I hate and attack only that aristocracy which is the caricature of what it should be, namely, that genuine aristocracy of mind without which the world does not get ahead."

In his boyhood Schücking often accompanied his father upon the latter's official expeditions, thus becoming minutely acquainted with that land of the "red soil," its steady-going people and its elegiac scenery, for which he always continued to feel a strong affection, and from which he professed to have drawn in after years the inspiration for his best and most characteristic work. His earliest considerable literary enterprise was to furnish the text for an illustrated work upon 'Romantic and Picturesque Westphalia.' He had taken the course of study necessary to fit him for the practice of the law, but upon returning from the University in 1838, he found no career open to him. His home had now become Prussian, and the bureaucrats of Friedrich Wilhelm III. looked upon him as a foreigner. So it came about that, having himself in reality but little fancy for the law, he made but one and that a half-hearted attempt to secure an official position, and then abandoned Themis for the Muses, as Goethe, Heine, Uhland, and many others had done before him. In 1843 he had become sufficiently known through divers short stories so that he was made an associate editor of the *Allgemeine Zeitung* at Augsburg. Two years later he accepted a similar position upon the *Kölnische Zeitung*, where he remained until 1852.

In his work upon these journals he kept, in the main, aloof from politics, his bent being rather for imaginative literature, more specifically for the historical romance. Of this, his life-long mental habit, and of its effects upon his intellectual existence, he speaks in these words: "I have never had to struggle with doubts or to fight my way painfully through to freedom, as has been the lot of many whose natural endowment was perhaps deeper than my own. From the historical bent that ruled me freedom came as a natural consequence, and I would say even now to all hampered souls (*gebundenen Seelen*), History will make you free." The account of these journalistic years teems with interesting matter from and concerning noted literary personages. Numerous letters of Gutzkow and of Freiligrath are printed, and two visits to Heine in Paris are described at some length. A curious half-insane letter of Lenau is given, perhaps the very last the unfortunate poet ever penned before the attack which sent him to end his days in a madhouse. Besides the men just named, Schücking stood on terms of intimate friendship with numerous other literary personages of hardly less note. Among these is to be mentioned the gifted poetess Annette von Droste, whose biography he wrote and to whom he was warmly attached from boyhood.

Not the least entertaining portion of his editorial reminiscences is that which has to do with the press censorship, that stupidest of all the stupid tyrannies under which German intelligence was condemned to struggle half a century ago. Readers of Heine will recall the stanza at the end of chapter xii in the "Wintermährchen":

> "Das war die Rede die ich hielt,
> Ganz ohne Vorbereitung;
> Verstümmelt hat Kolb sie abgedruckt
> In der *Allgemeinen Zeitung*."

Of this Kolb and of his efforts to conduct a great journal under exceedingly untoward circumstances, Schücking gives an interesting account. The most amusing thing in the memoirs is the statement, given apparently as sober fact, that a certain censor at Cologne forbade an advertisement of the 'Divine Comedy,' on the ground that people should not be making comedy of divine things. Of the same individual it is related that, having once received an official reprimand for allowing the publication of some correspondence dated "from the Murg," he thereafter systematically forbade everything purporting to come from the vicinity of a small German river: "der Henker soll die Schreibereien von dem kleinen Bachzeug holen," was the inflexible decree.

In 1847 Schücking was sent to Rome as correspondent of the *Kölnische Zeitung*. Here he witnessed that flood-tide of liberal enthusiasm which marked the earliest phase in the pontificate of Pius IX. He himself, in spite of his Northern blood and a certain very obvious indifference to matters of church dogma, seems to have caught, in mild form at least, the delirious infection of the hour. Along with the rest he indulged in his brief dream of a new, united, and purified church to be created by the liberal policy of the new Pope; a church that was to draw to itself the conservative elements of disintegrated and decaying Protestantism, and so move on to the undisputed religious sovereignty of the West. All this sounds strangely enough now, as does indeed the whole of our author's vivid and masterly description of that wild ebullition of ecclesiastical patriotism in 1848. With this description and this year, unfortunately, the memoirs end. The author had reached that point in his story when he was called away by death. A brief epilogue is added by an unnamed friend of the author.

Of Schücking as an imaginative writer, of his gifts and of his limitations as a story-teller, there is no occasion to speak in this short notice of his memoirs. The beginning of his fame was made by the romance 'Die Ritterbürtigen' in 1843. In 1846 he published a volume of poems, and in the succeeding years several dramas, one or two of which met with good success as acting plays. But his proper line of work was always, as he

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

himself thought, the historical romance; in this line his later years were prolific enough. In lieu of any enumeration or characterization of these works, let it suffice to quote a single sentence, in which he has given the world a summary statement of his literary purposes: "The fundamental idea of all my writings," he says, "is the emancipation of mankind in general, and of women in particular, from the bondage of those views and of those conventionalities which impede the individual in the exercise of his right of self-determination, and hinder his development to genuine humanity."

On Speech Formation as the Basis for True Spelling. By Henry Freeman. London: Trübner & Co. 1886. Small 8vo, pp. 88.

THAT the orthography of the English language is sadly in need of reformation is a proposition the truth of which has long been admitted by all educated persons, except a small minority of whom the late Mr. Richard Grant White may be regarded as the chief exemplar. If among that small minority there are any who have kept run of the writings of German scholars upon the subject of orthography during the last quarter of a century, they must have been astonished at the amount of discussion to which the comparatively few orthographical anomalies of the German language have given rise. Had the scholars of England and America devoted a proportional amount of time and labor to the discussion of the anomalies of English orthography, they would hardly have been able to make even an excursion into any other field of study. We have, however, had discussion enough, but the trouble with it all has been that while the conservatives have mostly confined themselves to the recommendation of an obstinate adherence to the existing system, or rather to the existing confusion, the reformers have been prodigal of schemes generally impracticable, often absurd, sometimes ludicrous. The natural result of all this has been that many, perhaps most, of those who have a lively sense of the incongruities of English spelling, despair of any practicable method of reformation, and reject at once and without examination any new scheme that may be brought forward.

To one acquainted with the orthographical systems of any considerable number of other nations, English spelling appears like a gigantic puzzle, constructed expressly for the torment of children, without any of that pleasurable suspense, seasoned with the hope of ultimate success, which renders the solution of puzzles one of the most delightful recreations of boys and girls. At the same time mistakes in spelling are regarded much in the light of unpardonable sins. A scrawling, half-illegible handwriting will be passed over as a personal peculiarity; an awkward or ungrammatical sentence will be attributed to haste or carelessness; but a mispelled word becomes at once a source of shame on the part of the writer and of contempt on the part of the reader. It is regarded as the badge of lack of culture, and by some curious mental process it often happens that those are most unsparing in their ridicule who did not dare to jeer until they had themselves consulted the dictionary. It will thus be seen that there are social as well as other reasons for trying to lessen the difficulties of learning to spell.

Mr. Freeman professes to have this end in view. His little book is very handsome. The paper is white, the margins are wide, the print is clear, the binding is neat, and it bears the imprint of one of the most respectable and widely-known publishing houses of London. How so many fortunate circumstances can have concurred in assisting at the birth of so much absurdity is a mystery which we do not pretend to solve. In most cases a reviewer would simply toss such a book as this into the ever-growing heap of those which deserve only to be passed over in silence. But to any one who believes in the possibility and practicability of some reform in English spelling, it seems a kind of duty, if possible, to "squelch" a book which can only assist in rendering all attempts at reform ridiculous. In reading certain pages the idea suggested itself that perhaps the author was not to be taken seriously, and that we had to deal with a parody or a satire on the many absurd books, treating the same subject, which have hitherto appeared. But such an idea was immediately negatived by the general tone of the work. A parody should have somewhat of humor, a satire somewhat of wit. This book has neither; it is throughout insufferably dull. It must then be taken for what it purports to be, an exposition of a new system of English spelling, and a system, too, which the author hopes and expects to see adopted in practice.

Mr. Freeman regards his present system of spelling as only transitional. At some future time it is to be superseded by a system in which some new characters are to be introduced, to represent elementary sounds which he is now compelled to indicate by combinations of the letters at present in use; and he has stated briefly the principles upon which some of them should be constructed. But we are quite sure that his notions in regard to the nature and mode of production of the elementary sounds are so completely erroneous that his last system would be worse than his first. He is also obliged to mix Roman and Italic letters in the same words, a process which renders the page so unsightly that it would probably of itself prevent the general adoption of his system, but which is perhaps excusable on the ground that it is the only method of bringing his system within the capabilities of the fonts of type in an ordinary printing-office. The fifth and last chapter of Mr. Freeman's book, occupying pages 86 and 87, treats of the quality of sounds, and is printed in the new orthography. The first two sentences printed in the ordinary manner read as follows:

"A good deal is vaguely set down to quality, insomuch that the term has become reduced in meaning to a considerable degree of indefiniteness. Used, however, in reason and in its right place, it is a convenient term."

In the author's new spelling these sentences stand thus:

"U GUD del iz *veigli* set *daun* tu kwholiti, in*soumutsh* that thu *turum* haz bikum *ridiust* in menin *tu* u khnsidurubl digre uv indefinitnis. *Yiuzd*, *hauevu*, in *rezn* an in its *rait* plheis, it iz u *khnveniunt turum*."

A Commonplace Book of the Fifteenth Century. Printed from the original manuscript at Brome Hall, Suffolk, by Lady Caroline Kerrison. Edited with Notes by Lucy Toulmin Smith. London: Trübner & Co. 1886.

THIS book is the first complete reproduction in print of the manuscript volume named in the title. About one-half of it consists of poems written in a hand of the latter half of the fifteenth century; the rest is made up of documents partly of a public and partly of a private nature. These latter will have their special interest to men engaged in the investigation of local customs and the variations of price at different periods; but to the purely literary student the chief value of the volume will be the Old English poems which are contained in the first half. Several of these are of some length and importance. They are variant versions of what is to be found elsewhere, but the variations are in many cases so great that the whole poem approaches the character of a unique original. The piece entitled "Adrian and Epotys" will perhaps be of most interest to the average student, and a very brief account of it will give the reader a satisfactory idea of the volume as a whole. Adrian and Epotys is not a story, but a dialogue between the Emperor Adrian and a child who presents himself before him, styling himself Epotys, but who turns out at the end to be Christ. The Emperor asks the child a series of questions, and the replies made furnish an illustration of the beliefs then held and the things then taught about philosophy and religion. Some of the answers give little more than the information contained in the Bible narrative. Others are interesting because they show that then, as now, men made up by assertion in matters of education for what they lacked in certainty or evidence. The questions asked were frequently about things—such as the constitution of the angelic hierarchy—which nobody can possibly know; the answers, therefore, were such as no one could deny. As good an illustration and, to men of our day, as entertaining a one as can be selected of this method of instruction, are the thirteen reasons furnished the Emperor by the child why men should fast on Friday rather than on any other day. The first is, God created man on Friday; the second, that on Friday Adam and Eve lost Paradise; the third, that on Friday Cain killed Abel; the fourth, that on Friday the annunciation was made to the Virgin Mary by the angel Gabriel; the fifth, that on Friday Christ was born; the sixth, that on Friday he was circumcised; the seventh, that on Friday Stephen, the proto-martyr, was stoned to death; the eighth, that on Friday John the Baptist was beheaded; the ninth, that on Friday Christ was crucified; the tenth, that on Friday the Virgin Mary died; the eleventh, that on Friday Saint Andrew was crucified; the twelfth, that on Friday Saint Helen succeeded in finding at Calvary the true cross; and the thirteenth, that on Friday God shall come to judge the world.

Besides "Adrian and Epotys" the volume contains the version of a play on the subject of Abraham's sacrifice of Isaac, varying in many respects from the others that exist. Space does not permit us, however, to treat these separate pieces in detail, but the whole work is an interesting contribution to the ever-increasing series of publications which set out to furnish us original documents by which we can study the language, the beliefs, and the lives of our fathers. From the editor of this book we have learned to expect careful and thorough work, nor are we disappointed in this instance. To each article is prefixed a notice which gives sufficient information as to the subject of the piece, and, in the case of the longer poems, of the various versions which exist of it. No glossary has been supplied, but it was probably felt not to be needed. The work is designed for special students, and, except for an occasional wantonness of orthography, the text is not of a character to present any special difficulty.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Adams, O. F. April. Boston: D. Lothrop & Co. 75 cents.
Anster, J. Goethe's Faust. Translated from the German. Introduction by Rev. H. R. Haweis. Harper & Bros. 25 cents.
Appleton's Annual Cyclopædia and Register of Important Events of the Year 1885. D. Appleton & Co. $5.
Bruell, J. D. Sea Memories, or Personal Experiences in the United States Navy in Peace and War. Boston: Cupples, Upham & Co.
Century Magazine. Vol. XXXI. November, 1885—April, 1886. The Century Co. $3.
Classical Atlas. Twenty-three Colored Maps. Boston: Ginn & Co.
Dabney, V. The Story of Don Miff, as Told by his Friend John Bouche Whacker. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. $1.50.
Droz, E. Etude sur le scepticisme de Pascal. Boston: Schoenhof.
Encyclopædia Britannica. Vol. XX. 9th ed. Prudentius—Roswitha. Charles Scribner's Sons. Boston: Little Brown & Co.
Foote, Mary H. John Bodewin's Testimony. Boston: Ticknor & Co. $1.50.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED